National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS.

VOL. XII. NO. 3.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1851.

WHOLE NO. 575.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & brother, printers.—Thursday, June 5, 1851.

Selections.

SECESSION DOCTRINES OF THE SOUTH.

ABOLITION DOCTRINES IN THE NORTH.

SPEECH OF HON. B. R. RHETT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Delivered at Hibernian Hall, April 7th, 1851, at a Meeting of the Southern Rights Association.

FELLOW CITIZENS: I am indebted, I presume, to the fact that I am but lately from the seat of Government, for the invitation I have received to address you this night, and for the warm reception with which you have greeted me. You know my opinions, frankly expressed, on the past state of our affairs. But you wish to know whether I see anything in their present condition which has changed or modified these opinions.

Gentlemen, I can teach you nothing, and I presume you desire to hear nothing, of those wrongs which have aroused within you the determination to redress yourselves. South Carolina, in her Legislature, long since declared that, with respect to them, the argument was exhausted. She will no more reason with her sister States concerning them; and we, I think, need no more reason, concerning them, amongst ourselves. Our understandings are sufficiently informed. All we want is the will, in the face of acknowledged wrongs, to right ourselves. It is on this point, and this only, the mode of redress, that I propose, in a very simple way, to submit to you a few brief considerations.

Your last Legislature looked to two expedients for redress—secession from the Union in co-operation with other Southern States, and secession by South Carolina alone. With the exception of less than a half dozen members, all the members of the Legislature were disunionists. Those who were in favor of disunion, in concert with other Southern States, limited their policy to the call of a Southern Congress. Those who, despairing of the co-operation of any other State, were in favor of secession by South Carolina alone, supported the call of a State Convention. The latter prevailed by a large majority in the Senate, and their bill was sent down to the House calling a State Convention. It there failed for want of a few votes necessary to give the two-thirds majority required by the constitution to call a convention. On the other hand, the Southern Congress bill failed also in the House, where it originated. As all aimed at the same end, it was soon agreed to pass both measures. All desired a Southern Congress for redress, if it could be obtained. Time would, in a very few months, settle its practicability, whilst the call of a State convention would put in the power of South Carolina, in case her invitation for a Southern Congress should be declined by the other Southern States, to go out of the Union alone. A bill embodying these measures passed both branches of the Legislature by an overwhelming majority—far more than the two-thirds required by the constitution to summon the people in convention.

My friends, time, resistless time—the great discloser of our destinies—the iron instrument of Providence in working His decrees—has settled at least one branch of this policy. Southern co-operation is at an end. The Governor of your State, in obedience to your command, has sent to every Southern State your invitation to meet you at Montgomery, in Alabama, to confer on the wrongs we have endured, and the dangers which environ the South. All are silent save one; but that one has spoken for all. Virginia, who first counselled us by one Legislature to resist the Wilmot Proviso or any kindred measure, at all hazards, and to the last extremity—Virginia, who, at a succeeding Legislature, repeated this counsel, and drew after her the whole South in support—now, when the wrongs and outrages anticipated have been actually perpetrated, and the South, with her institution of Slavery, is excluded from every foot of our territories acquired from Mexico—Virginia succumbs. Nay, more—she not only submits, but brings herself forward to obtain the submission of others. South Carolina, ready to follow her first noble lead, adopted her brave resolves, word for word. There they stand on the records of the State. No sophistry can expunge them. Dishonor, even, cannot obliterate them. They live, and must live forever, a bright memorial of our consistency and firmness in the vindication of our rights, or a foul stain on our yet unblemished fame, and a contemptible burlesque on the sovereignty of the States. Virginia now leads the way to submission. Excepting South Carolina, Mississippi alone seems capable of maintaining the first high counsels of Virginia. Her people certainly appear to be actuated by a deep sense of the wrongs of the South, and a resolute will to redress them. But Mississippi is practically a land bound State. She has no seaport suitable for transatlantic commerce. The depth of water on her bar does not exceed six feet. For this reason, if for no other, she cannot secede from the Union without her coterminous States. If she secedes without Louisiana or Alabama, receiving all her supplies of foreign commerce through them, she would still be in the Union, so far as the taxes levied on her foreign commerce by the general government are concerned. The citizens consuming the goods imported from foreign nations, would pay, in their consumption, the taxes levied on them in the ports of other States. Mississippi would thus be not practically independent—not independent in that greatest function of all government, the greatest test of liberty with our Anglo-Saxon race—the imposition of taxes. She will, therefore, not go out of the Union with us. Co-operation with her in a measure of secession is out of the question, and probably it is better for us that she should not go out of the Union along with us. In the Union she will have a certain influence on the other Southern States, which we, out of it, would not possess. Our final object is beyond single State secession; and we will want States in, as well as out of, the Union to bring on that object to its accomplishment. With the failure of Mississippi to give us her co-operation, ends all Southern co-operation; no Southern Congress will meet. Our sister Southern States decline our solicitation to meet us in counsel. They tell us plainly, in declining our invitation, "We will not, or cannot, aid you; take care of your own destiny." Surely, if we now move on alone to redress our common wrongs, no charge of precipitancy, or of ambitious leadership, can, with any show of justice, be made against us. We have done all which a delicate regard to their position has required us to do. We have implored them to lead us. We have implored them to co-operate with us. They will do neither, after pledging themselves to do both. Now, then, that we take our fate into our own hands, are we not entitled to their sympathy—their hearty good wishes for our success? For my part, if they will give us those, it is all I would desire in the present state of things in the South. A Southern Congress now would be our ruin. With Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee—in such a Congress, what would be its counsel? Submission—submission for themselves—submission for us; and should we in disgust retire from the Congress we ourselves had invoked, or cast their counsels under our feet, might we not excite the resentment and alienation of our sister Southern States composing it? I rejoice, therefore, that no Southern Congress will meet; for no Southern Congress can meet to redress the wrongs of the South. Alone we must move; and alone it is best for us to move, in the present condition of things. So fatal would be the tendency of a Southern Congress that I should not be at all surprised if, before long, one is got up by the administration at Washington, or is proposed to us by the most thorough submission States. General Jackson's cabinet, it is now known, was the author of Mr. Watkins Leigh's mission to South Carolina, in 1833. The General held out nothing but the most defying threats to us, as the administration now affects to do, whilst his secret fears were displayed in his secret instigation of this mission, to bring us to acquiescence in the tariff compromise. Stranger things than these may take place, if South Carolina secedes from the Union.

However matters may have stood formerly, the only alternative now presented to us is submission or secession by South Carolina alone. Now, as we who have been for secession by South Carolina alone, heartily labored with our friends who were in favor of the co-operation of other Southern States, since their policy has become impracticable, ought they not to join with us in the last and only measure of redress that is left? They may have doubts of its success, as we have had of their policy; but, with their consciousness of the wrongs of the South, and the dangers which environ us, and their high regard for the honor of our State, can they counsel us to submission? Will they any longer divide from us, and spread weakness throughout our counsels? Will they not rather join us, and make with us one brave and united effort for redress and independence, by the secession of South Carolina alone from the Union? They must and will soon be with us. They cannot join the Union party, which is soon to arise in South Carolina.

Secession, then—secession by South Carolina alone—is to be our policy. Let us look it fairly in the face, and try to estimate its probable consequences. Probability is all which exists for us justly in the future. Certainty is in the past and present only.

In the first place, in seceding from the Union, we would declare free trade absolutely, as it now exists, with all the States South of the Potomac and Ohio rivers. There would be no change whatever, so far as our action is concerned, in any of the relations we now hold towards these States. All their productions, cotton, wheat, tobacco, live stock, will enter our State as heretofore, free of all charge or duty whatever. With respect to the productions of the other States now in the Union, and all foreign nations, we would lay a small duty on importation, not exceeding ten per cent ad valorem (seven per cent was the first duty laid by our ancestors in putting the present government into operation, with a heavy war debt to discharge). Thirty per cent is the duty now exacted by the general government in all the ports of the United States, on the chief articles of importation. Our duty of ten per cent will thus be twenty per cent less than the duty exacted in the ports of the Union. The effect must be that goods in Charleston must be twenty per cent cheaper than in the ports of the United States. To the agricultural interest of the State, no one can doubt the benefit. Our planters and farmers, and all other consumers in the State, must be supplied with goods twenty per cent cheaper than they have heretofore obtained them. It is clear, therefore, that to the great mass of the people of South Carolina, secession, under such circumstances, must be advantageous. Property of all kinds must be more valuable, because more profitable in South Carolina than where the greater burdens exist. There is but one interest which may be injuriously affected, and that is the mercantile interest. Trade is very timid. It is liable to panics; and when confidence is unimpaired, it is not easy to change the channels of commerce without some loss, although that change may be from less to more profitable channels. Our merchants will have to change their importations from New York and Boston to Liverpool and Havre; but they will have their goods twenty per cent cheaper than in the ports of the United States. The merchants in the interior of our own State will have no inducement to go to New York, as they now do, to lay in their supplies. They will make their purchases in Charleston. Here is a certain demand on the commerce of Charleston, which does not now exist. And out of our State, will not the merchants of other States, for the same cause, pursue the same policy? So far as our importations from those States are concerned, we would be exactly as we now are. The only difference in our trade will be, that our merchants will be able to offer to those who send us their productions from other States, their supplies twenty per cent cheaper than heretofore. Will this interrupt their trade? The Northern manufacturers and producers, for whose benefit the high discriminating duties in the present tariff of the United States are laid, will certainly object to such a trade. They will be clamorous to enforce out of the people of Georgia and North Carolina, and the other Southern States, the collection of the thirty per cent duty they have laid by the general government on every Southern consumer for their benefit. They now control the general government, and, I suppose, will endeavor, by their custom house officers, to prevent the people of other States from buying from us. But all such efforts will fail, unless human nature shall be marvellously changed by our secession. In the opinion of a vast majority of the people of the Southern States, the present tariff, in principle, is utterly unconstitutional. It is only an expedient, by which tribute is exacted from the South by the North. But, independently of this, Hamburg lies opposite to Augusta; Purysburg is not far from Savannah; whilst we have a common right to navigate the Savannah and Pee Dee rivers, from their borders to their mouths. Our trade with North Carolina is chiefly carried on by wagons. How long will custom house officers on our North Carolina frontier continue to seize the wagons of the North Carolina farmers and wagoners, on their return from South Carolina with their usual supplies? How long will the people of Georgia submit to a standing army of tax collectors on their side of the Savannah river, spying, seizing, fighting them, to enforce the collection of duties their Abolition brethren of the North have laid upon them? We will have nothing to do with spying or fighting. On our side of the river, we will have ease and peace. No controversy with the people of Georgia—no controversy with the general government, or its officers. We have goods to sell twenty per cent cheaper than they can be obtained in New York, or in any port in the Union—that is all. We will neither force other people to buy them, nor enter other States to sell them. The trade, if it exists, will be at the option of those who think proper to come to us and buy our goods. Relations of entire amity, and of mutual benefit, not of hostility or injury, will thus exist between us and the Southern States. I am inclined to think the trade of our merchants, under such circumstances, will not become quite extinguished. I am inclined to think that the same state of things which now exists on our Canada frontier, under the skilful address of our Yankee friends, will also prevail along the frontiers of South Carolina. Twenty per cent will not stop goods on an imaginary frontier. It gives immense activity to bales and boxes, as well as to men's wits. It will not destroy our merchants. It will make our trade pretty nearly as free in going out as in entering our State. This is certainly the opinion of the merchants in our Northern cities. They, therefore, look upon the secession of South Carolina from the Union with alarm and terror, anticipating the loss of the whole import trade, which is occasioned by Southern productions. It will come to us, they say. I think they are right; for however fallacious their judgments may be on other subjects, in matters of money they are as near infallibility as human beings can be. We must gain what they lose, and our commerce will prosper beyond every other interest in the State. Charleston, the emporium of this commerce, must especially rise in prosperity.—Every householder, every mechanic, every laborer, will feel the impulse which new demands for labor and capital must produce; whilst we will demonstrate to the world what liberty and just government can do for a people.

"All this seems very fair and clear," I think I hear an old merchant say; "but what of that blockade? If enforced against us, we will not be able to buy, much less to sell." I answer: The blockade is a humbug. It would probably be better for us if it should turn out a reality; but as things are, I am compelled to say, from a regard to truth, that I believe it to be an unmitigated humbug. Blockade is war. If we secede from the Union, we will secede during the sitting of the next Congress. Congress alone can declare war. Congress must vote the supplies, and authorize the use of the army and navy against us. One of two alternatives Congress must choose—let us go peaceably out of the Union, or fight us. I believe everybody gives us the very common credit of not being very great laggards at fighting. If war is made upon us, we will fight—on land or sea we will fight—and if any one supposes that war in any form can be made on South Carolina without fighting, he is not worth reasoning with. Where there is a will, there is a way, in war as in other things. We will fight—fight long, and, if necessary, I trust, we will fight everlastingly, in defence of the sovereignty of our State, and of our dearest rights, liberties and institutions. What can the Northern people gain in such a contest but inevitable defeat and disaster? Give them all they can possibly expect to accomplish. Suppose that they are not embroiled with other nations, for lawlessly interrupting a commerce as much theirs as ours, and that we are at last vanquished and subdued—will that preserve the Union? They may have a province held in subjection by military force; but can they make us, against our will, a State of the Union? Can they force us to elect Senators or Representatives to Congress? By our secession, the Union is dissolved, and will stand dissolved by our mere non-action. But if this policy of coercion is pursued, will disunion be limited to South Carolina alone? Does any man believe that the general government can carry on a war against a Southern State, for exercising her right of seceding from the Union, in defence of her liberties and institutions, and that no other Southern State will join her in the contest? The right of secession is the right of all. Surrender it, and they are no longer sovereignties. They are not parties to the constitutional compact, but mere provinces of one vast consolidated empire, under the absolute sway of the free States in the North, through the majority in Congress. The Southern States will have no defence, either in the Union or out of the Union, to stay the strong hand of usurpation and Abolition, growing stronger every day; and if they suffer South Carolina to be subjugated by the sword, her doom must soon be theirs, with the increased ferocity they will have inspired in our successful foes. I do not consider it to be a matter of doubt that if the free States use the general government to make war on South Carolina, and she fights as becomes her ancient renown, a Southern confederacy is as sure to come as the succeeding year. The Northern people, as well as the general government, know that this will be the result as well as we do; and therefore I have no expectation that any bill will ever pass Congress to coerce South Carolina from going out of the Union. No such bill, I am satisfied, could have passed the last Senate of the United States. Will Rhode Island, the last State to enter the Union, or Delaware, consent to be disrobed of their sovereignty? What are they in the Union without it, but aristocratic funguses on the body politic, to be cut off in the Senate by the equalizing sword of democracy? Could the Northwestern democrats, who so lately maintained that the right of self-government was so sacred in a people that the emigrants in California had a right to set up a government for themselves throughout that whole magnificent region, although owning not a foot of the soil, deny to the people of South Carolina the right they thus accorded to the people of California, and force on them a government they have repudiated? Could the Northeastern democrats, resting on the limitations of the constitution, as their great leader (Mr. Woodbury) has so long and so faithfully done, find any warrant in the constitution to coerce a State? How many Senators from the South are prepared to try the strength of the general government in coercing a Southern State to remain in the Union? There may be two, and you will not find it difficult to name them. My friends, I am satisfied that if South Carolina thinks proper to go out of the Union, she will go without a single hostile gun being fired, or a single tombstone being erected to tell a tale of martyrdom. On expressing such conviction to a distinguished officer of our State, immediately on my return from Washington, he exclaimed, "No fighting! Well, that is the worst news I have heard for a long time. How, in the name of heaven, are we to get the Southern confederacy?" I answered, "By just government, and a superior liberty." No. You will have no fighting, and I rejoice that the responsibility is not with us, whether we shall have it or not. We will have no fighting, not because you are loved, nor from any principle which restrains from shedding your blood. You are hated, no doubt, quite enough to bring on you any calamity which unscrupulous power, avarice or fanaticism can inflict. But there is policy in power—there is policy in avarice—there is policy in fanaticism; and all these perceive that to attempt to coerce South Carolina in any way, is to secure their own defeat, and our speedy deliverance from their degrading thraldom. They acquiesce only in the necessity of things.

That this is the policy determined now in Congress, may perhaps be strongly inferred from two facts—the Army Bill, proposing a considerable increase of the army, and the Fortification bill, both failed in the House of Representatives, at the close of the last session, by large majorities. The election in South Carolina to her Convention had then distinctly indicated her future course.

But I have heard it said, the general government will not blockade us entirely; they will only have a floating custom house in their ships of war off our coast, or exact the duties under the cannon of the forts in our harbor. I wish to meet all objections.

By this scheme of interfering with our commerce, it is not, in the first place, easy to perceive how duties can be collected on a whole cargo in bulk in the hold of a ship. To collect the duties the ship must be unloaded—the goods be seen, to be appraised; or seized if falsely invoiced, or not entered at all, to evade the duties. All of our custom house laws to prevent smuggling, and the evasion of duties, are based on the impossibility of collecting duties on goods in bulk in the hold of a ship. If it is the established law, that papers without the inspection of goods, or a captain's statement of what his ship contains, are to be the only proof of importations into Charleston, and the only criterion of the duties to be collected, the collection of duties will soon become a farce. Charleston will practically be a free port. Even ten per cent duties will hardly be levied on our imports. But the true answer to this mode of interfering with our commerce is, that it will be war. In seceding from the Union, South Carolina will exercise a right, which she, at least, deems unquestionable. When she has dissolved her Union with her co-States, she puts an end to her co-partnership with them—she puts an end to their common agent, the general government, so far as she is concerned. So long as the union between them lasts, their common agent, with her consent, and by no other means, discharges the duties which, by the compact of the constitution, she has agreed it shall discharge. But with our separation from the Union, goes all our relations with the other States of the Union. They are foreign nations—exactly on the same footing as Great Britain or France. Their government has no more right to interfere with our commerce, than the government of Great Britain or France. For either of these governments to attempt to collect taxes out of us, by forcibly controlling our commerce on the high seas, or in our harbors, is nothing more or less than levying military contributions on us—making war. Of course we will be compelled to fight with all the means in our power, and with all the allies we can command. We must storm the forts if we can, where this aggression is carried on, and capture the ships of war employed against us. It will be war on all sides—war in the South to subject the South, which will only end in a Southern confederacy, or the utter extinction of South Carolina as a State. If the government holds on to our forts merely as property belonging to the United States, it may be a question whether we ought not to pay for any property our co-States, through the general government might own in South Carolina. But in doing this, the account must be opened all around with our sister States. It will be upon them to show that the property in South Carolina exceeds our due proportion of expenditure from the treasury of the United States, when compared with the expenditure which has taken place in the other States of the Union. The public lands must also be brought into the account, with our navy and the public buildings in Washington. The debt for the war and purchase of California should be debited exclusively to the free States, since they have appropriated the whole of it to themselves. At all events, we will honestly and fairly meet any proposition to adjust any pecuniary liabilities our withdrawal from the Union may involve. But war cancels all obligations. If they choose it, we must accept of it. But I repeat, I do not believe that war of any kind will follow as a consequence of our secession from the Union, because war cannot prevent it, and will only lead to a wider disruption of the Union. It will be far easier, indeed, in my opinion, to get out of the Union, than to keep out of it. You see the movement already made in Virginia to keep us from going out of the Union. Such movements will be multiplied after we are out of it, to induce our return. Missions from our sister Southern States—concessions, with lavish professions of regard from the Northern States—abolition cowering for the while—Slavery agitation suppressed in Congress—tariff and internal improvements apparently abandoned—in short, everything will be done to conciliate the Southern States, and keep them from going with us out of the Union. In the meantime, our separation from the Union will be made as harassing as possible by the operations of the general government, to foster discontent in South Carolina, and defeat the advantages which will naturally arise from our separation. This will be our real time of trial. To hold on firmly to our purpose, of an entire redress for the past, and security for the future, or to keep out of the Union forever, will task all our fortitude and energy. Let them offer to us the Constitution of the United States, with that equality of rights and privileges all its spirit breathes; equality in Congress, where the disparaging and insulting agitation of the subject of Slavery shall no more enter forever: equality in taxation, without discriminations in favor of one pursuit of industry at the expense of another; equality in the expenditure of the taxes, by limiting appropriations to the objects expressly specified in the constitution; equality in our territories, at least as far as thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude can bestow it, from our Indian territories to the Pacific ocean—let them offer to us these, and all of these, secured to us by new and distinct guarantees in the constitution, and we will listen to invitations to return into the Union. To all else we should turn a deaf, but respectful ear. These are now ours, by right, under the Constitution of the United States. The free States have despoiled us of them. If they wish such a Union as the constitution establishes and their faith pledged them to observe, they can have it, if they will propose it. Any other it would be insult to offer. Voluntarily to go back into degrading inferiority and bondage, will be more infamous than to have endured it under the steady usurpations of the Northern States. Disunion, and disunion forever, or all our rights, should be our fixed and unalterable determination. Fear is a very unreasonable passion—often the more unreasonable when there is least to apprehend. We have alarmists from fear of war; but as the prospect of war disappears, we have greater alarmists for fear of peace. To the imaginations of some, nothing is so terrible as to be unmolested—to be let alone by the general government. If it fights us, this is a terror by no means to be encountered; but then, we will have company. But not to fight us, is a still greater terror. It is to leave us alone, without company. And what mortal man can face such a catastrophe? Why, gentlemen, I have thought that "*laissez nous faire*" (let us alone) was the grand principle of free trade, for which we have been contending for the last thirty years. I have thought that to be let alone was the grand principle of all free governments. Justice from without, against the aggressions or wrongs of foreign nations—justice within, between man and man—prevention merely, this is the righteous and limited aim of all free government. As to all else let us alone. What have we been asking, as to all the great measures of aggression, which have at length rendered the general government no longer endurable to free men, but "let us alone?" Let us alone on the tariff. Let us alone on internal improvements. Let us alone as to the currency. Let us alone with respect to our institution of Slavery. Keep to the simple purpose of prevention, for which you were created, and protect us against foreign nations. Such have been our demands. They are not heeded; and we cast off a tyranny which, like the frogs of Egypt, has come up into our houses, and our bed-chambers, and the houses of our servants. And now, shall we fear being rid of it? Shall we tremble at being let alone? Are we afraid of ourselves? or are we incapable of ruling ourselves? If so, it is sheer nonsense to aspire to liberty or independence. Let us submit at once, without murmurs, and without efforts for deliverance, to be the colonies we are in reality. Blot out the proud motto from our arms, and let our flag, once free, never more greet the sun. If our enemies think proper, let them lay in waste a thousand miles around us. Let them make South Carolina an island on the continent—cut off forever from all sympathy or association with any other State in the Union. Who will suffer most by this policy? To reach us, the dagger must pass through others. The great world of commerce is before us, over the broad Atlantic. We can live, and if we can live free, it is enough. Better any fate than the slow torturing death which awaits us in submission. If our neighboring States choose this death, and think proper to let the general government stop up the channels of their commerce with us, let them do it. If they have not had enough of its interference in their affairs, they can take it still nearer home to their business and bosoms, although tainted with abolitionism itself. But I believe in the prevalence of no such policy. South Carolina, in the heart of the South, cannot be permanently isolated from them in policy, as she cannot be in interests and institutions. The general government may make some spasmodic efforts to produce this result; but if we stand still and firm, they will fail, as the passions of the present give way before the mighty tide of interests which must sweep the South together.

But secession will not only bring us isolation in the South, but heavy burdens in the personal military services we must render and the increased taxes we must pay. We are to live in military boots, with knapsacks on our backs, and have costly foreign embassies, and a standing army and navy to support.

It is not for freemen to count the cost of a free government. Let it cost what it may—life itself—they will be prepared to pay it. But free governments should certainly be the cheapest, because most just and most responsible to the people. I see no reason why South Carolina should be an exception to this general truth. Assuming to ourselves the conduct of our foreign relations, will, doubtless, add something to our expenses. A foreign mission may occasionally be necessary; but there will be no necessity of standing embassies to any foreign powers. Our policy, I think, should be—free trade, equal and just dealing with all nations, entangling alliances with none. Our productions and commerce will appeal to the interests of all nations to do us justice, and secure us peace. If any nation offends or wrongs us, we have a powerful means of redress or retaliation, by shutting them out of our commerce, and thus adding to the prosperity of other and rival nations at their expense. Navies we do not want; for we have no shipping on the ocean to protect. Not one bag of cotton in fifty, when it leaves our ports, belongs to our citizens. It belongs to the citizens of other nations, and goes on the ocean under their flags; and under the same flags all produce belonging to our citizens can easily reach foreign ports. We want no standing army beyond what will be necessary to man the forts in our harbor. We intend to assail or harrass no one on our borders. The advantages we will enjoy by our extrication from the oppression and dangers of the general government, we will freely impart to others; and will expect to win that friendliness and confidence which all good officers should inspire. But to meet the extraordinary expenses to which we will be subjected, how great will be our additional resources through the customs! How great, too, will be the benefit, especially to the city of Charleston, of expending all the taxes thus raised within our own State, amongst our own people! The city of Washington, as well as all the great Northern cities, are standing monuments of what the mere expenditure of money amongst a people can do for their enrichment. There, on the Potomac, is a large increasing city, of fifty thousand inhabitants, where, a few years ago, there was an old field. It is a mere consumer, and exports not a dollar's worth of produce. I think the additional means secession will secure us, will more than meet the additional expenses we must incur by our independency.

I have thus, fellow citizens, endeavored briefly to lay before you the probable consequences of the secession of South Carolina from the Union. I have argued the question of secession as if it was a final separation from all the States of the South. But is this a correct method of arguing this question? If our cause is the cause of the whole South—at least, of the cotton region of the South—will not the South in due time perceive the truth? If in origin, pursuits, and institutions, we are one, how long will we remain apart, through the influence of those who have wronged and degraded us, and who now threaten our utter ruin in the overthrow of our institutions? Will they prefer a union with the free States, with inferiority and colonial dependence; or a union with us, with equality and independence? Safety and honor are on the one hand—danger and degradation on the other. Increasing power and respectability among the nations of the earth, whose prosperity we will hold in the hollow of our hands; or increasing weakness, with a government under whose prestige they and their institutions become the scoff of nations. These are the alternatives, which truth and experience must present to all impartial minds in the South. Where must they ultimately lead, unless but to a union of the South? If South Carolina secedes from the Union, and remains an independent State for five years, a Southern Confederacy must be the result, or the South will have enforced those guarantees which will give her that safety, liberty and equality, to which she is entitled. I have been battling in this cause for twenty-five years, and have now but a few more years to give to your service. I long to see it settled. As a citizen of South Carolina, I demand that she makes me free. Let her determine, new and forever, the fate of her sons. My counsel is, secede from the Union of these United States. "At every hazard, and to the last extremity," secede. If I was now about to draw my last breath, with that breath I would exhort you to secede. And above all, my friends, let us be united in secession. Our disunion will alone tempt an effort at coërcion. Our disunion can alone bring us defeat. Let us be charitable to each other; and hold every man to be a brother who agrees with us as to the wrongs we have endured, and is intent on redressing them. When the State Convention shall determine on the mode of redress—when it withdraws this State from the Union, all these will be with us: and in their generous rivalry for the maintenance of the honor and liberty of South Carolina, they will perhaps surpass us all in patriotic energy and usefulness. Unite—and unite in secession, and, with God's blessing, redemption is at hand for us and ours.

WE feel assured that no apology need be made to our readers for the space which we have devoted in this number to the various proceedings of the Convention. No subject, connected with our well-being as a people, can at this day so fully claim the interest of Carolinians as that which has been deliberated upon by this Convention. It is not a question the decision of which will temporarily affect the State, which will merely advance or retard her in her course of prosperity; but it is one of liberty, of honor, of existence; for without liberty, such as we have been accustomed to and as the character of our people entitles them to enjoy, without that honor which from the beginning has belonged to South Carolina, of ever maintaining the right, of opposing the wrong, of being an inferior and a subject to no power, without these what would be existence to us? What Carolinian would prize it? And yet, without fault of our own, these worse than dangers seem before us in our path. What was our creature now threatens to be our master. Constituted as the safeguard of our liberties, the General Government is now the chief source of danger to them. Liberty is but the assured enjoyment of our rights and one of the highest of these is that of property. It is one of the chief objects for the institution of government, and it requires no political education to say that that government is worthless which does not secure to its citizens the possession and enjoyment of what they honestly own, and that that is a despotism which takes it away from them, or which, permitting them to be nominal owners, assumes the power of disposing of it. Now what part has South Carolina been permitted to take in the use, management and disposal of our vast Western possessions? To whom did they belong but to the States? but this State has not been permitted to use or manage any part of them; she has been ridiculed and denounced because she claimed that she owned a share in them, and the General Government has disposed of them, not only without consulting her wishes but in direct opposition to those wishes. Here is a gigantic spoliation, a wresting from us of our property upon a vast scale by our own Government. Does it not answer to the definition of despotism? And the condition of being the despoiled party, the prey of government, is to be our status in this Union. We are the weaker party; the Northern majority is growing daily, and with accessions of power? But it is degradation enough for Carolinians to be at the mercy of a majority; to feel that, after all that has been taken from them, they own more than a hundred millions of dollars worth of slave property only so long as a Northern Anti-Slavery majority shall accord them permission. The North has not yet bent her energies to the work she has set before her; she is undecided as yet whether, having restricted its extension, she shall permit Slavery to continue and grow within those confined limits until it shall stifle itself for want of room, or whether she shall at once legislate its extinction. Messrs. Clay and Webster and others may keep off the latter doom during the few years they have to live; though that is doubtful, for Massachusetts, by electing Sumner has repudiated Webster; but the former lingering, death is fixed and certain. While we live, Northern manufacturers, contractors, office holders and the myriad of other harpies, will be fattened on our substance; federal taxation will, with Southern money, beautify, improve and develope all the resources and strength of the North, and build ships and raise armies and provide munitions of war to repress revolts in the Southern provinces. Cuba's condition will be ours while we are permitted to hold our slaves; after that we have to contemplate the condition of St. Domingo or Jamaica as our destiny. There are but few individuals in this State who do not see these dangers impending over us; and the majority of these feel thus secure simply because, patriotic and loyal themselves, they cannot but believe that the Northern people will return to justice and fraternal feeling. Every aggression they think will be the last: though every aggression is used as a precedent for the exaction of a still more unrighteous claim. With these exceptions our people are of one mind; they feel this Union to be the most dangerous enemy they have; that they have not so much in the whole world, out of it, to fear as in it; that it has made encroachment after encroachment upon their rights, and that, while they are united with the North, their destinies as a people are not in their own hands. And that we see our dangers is a reason to believe that we shall be delivered; for God blinds those whom he wishes to destroy. This State may be said to be unanimous in the determination, as there is no hope of security in the Union, to go out of it. The only question has been, how shall we best accomplish the great purposes we have in view; will it be wiser to wait for co-operation or to secede at once. On this point a difference of opinion has been expressed. With the same love for their State, the same identification of her existence and her honor with their own, the judgment of some, and among them some whom this State has delighted to honor, and whose opinions she always will respect, have influenced them to oppose what they deem precipitancy of action. And it may be well for us that we have prudent counsellors to show us all the responsibilities and difficulties of the issue we are about to make and to advise us against rashness and precipitancy. But no dangers are, we conceive, to be compared to those which would result from this division of opinion producing a division of feeling, inflaming into party spirit and arraying one body of our citizens against another to the neglect of resistance to the common enemy. We are all brothers in history and in sympathies, and to continue free and happy we must remain united in feeling, however our opinions may differ. It was to prevent a disastrous division among ourselves, to harmonize conflicting opinions by fraternal consultation and devise some mode, in which all could unite, of effecting the object which was common to all, that this Convention assembled. And it is a bright augury for our cause that that meeting was indeed a consultation of brothers, that courtesy and decorum marked every act, that patriotism seemed to be the only impulse, and that, under these influences, harmony and almost unanimity was brought about, as to the principles involved and the purposes to be effected, though the policy of one or another course was not equally apparent to all; and may we not hope that every one of us, if his judgment should not concur in the views expressed by the majority, will give his hearty assent to the resolution submitted by the minority of the Committee and abide by the action of the Convention of the People of South Carolina whatever that shall be.—*Sumter* (*S. C.*) *Banner.*

NON-INTERCOURSE.

As a most effectual method of counteracting the fanaticism of the North, and resisting the influence of their hostility to our institutions—as a means of controlling that spirit of agrarianism, which would place the balance of power in the hands of those who so unwisely wield it, and who in point of moral standard have proved themselves so unworthy to possess it, by acts which would shame any civilized people of the present age—as a most effectual method of counteracting these, restoring that balance of power now lost to the South, and strengthening ourselves beyond the possibility of encroachment—we have spoken of Non-Intercourse. To favor this view, let us look at the influence of some of the more partial methods which have been adopted for the purpose of retaliation, and from their own confessions may the most satisfactory conclusions be drawn of the probable effect of a more organized and extensive system, if consistently adhered to. A gentleman of the North, and quite an extensive merchant, assures us, in reference to a branch of his business in Boston, which has suffered generally from the late system of non-intercourse adopted by the South, and which has been extremely partial, that if things continued in this way two or three months longer, it would be most effectually destroyed. Suppose, for instance, that the whole South were to put into effect a resolution of this kind for one or two years, what would be the result? Withhold our produce, which we can easily do for this short term—buy nothing of them—what is to become of Northern enterprise? What will it have to work upon? What is to support its commerce?—for these are all maintained by protective laws, or they could not otherwise compete with foreign markets, or even exist. Where would be the wealth of her large commercial towns?

The productions of the North for manufacturing purposes are similar to those of England and many other parts of the world in which competition by these would most effectually reduce and impoverish her, while the South from having little in any competition in those articles which it produces, Cotton, Rice, Sugar, &c., could most effectually command, as she ought, the trade and commerce of the world, give laws to those who now control her from the want of some system of more concerted action, and become the rulers as they are now the ruled. Yes, we sincerely believe that one short year would bring the most stubborn of our foes to their senses, and make them feel the power of that relation which now supports and maintains them. They would feel that inferiority which is only veiled from their eyes, and from the effects of which they are now shielded by Southern wealth, and which alone keeps the very grass from growing in the streets of her most wealthy and populous towns. This would indeed be a system of punishment as effectual as the most embittered among us could desire. It was intended, by every thing capable of illustrating it in nature, that the people of the South should hold in their own hands that power which the superiority of their moral station have so fitted them for maintaining. The North is now seriously battling against fanaticism, aroused and alarmed by the knowledge of their dependence upon us and the probable effect of any system of non-intercourse—her presses teem with calls upon the people to remember this relation, and as a matter of interest to suppress further efforts to disturb the quiet of the government. Is it love of order which does this? Is it the love of our institutions? No! it is the knowledge of that powerful handle which the South holds in her own grasp, and by which she could, if so disposed, at any time scatter poverty and distress over their now flourishing land. Truly the South knows not her power. Would you check abolition societies? Would you possess California? Would you have your share in every addition made to this republic since its establishment?—Would you remain in the Union, lords and masters, as you really are, giving laws to the rabble hordes who now insult you? Would you have the constitution in its original purity, and yourselves the jealous defenders of the same, its appointed guardians? Thus may you have your desires accomplished. Thus may you become the lords and masters by exercising the power which you now possess, but which in the tempest of indignation produced by insult, injury, and aggression seems to have been entirely lost sight of. What causes our flag to be respected on every sea, wherever its starry folds are spread? What dazzles the eyes of the European as he gazes on the progress of our spreading republic? Why is it their adulations are wasted upon the North? It is the power of her commercial relations, her ships, her fleets, her successful competition by the materials with which we supply her and the power and importance generally, which she maintains only through these sources and by these relations. Withdraw from her even those taxes upon our pleasures and amusements which flow into every channel, enriching the soil of Yankee industry, one of the veins by which the South is annually drained of its treasure and watch the effects of it.

Look at the present contest now going on at the North. Cast but your eyes over the journals of this portion of the country; we do not allude to such hireling sheets as the *Palladium*, Portland *Advertiser* New Hampshire *Statesman*, and the like, but to others whose respectability is acknowledged by all parties, and what will it show but the triumph of democracy occasioned by the effects of most partial resistance through measures such as we have recommended.—In a call on the lovers of Union made by the Columbia *Register*, of New Haven, Conn., it thus prefaces the article: "A manufacturer from one of the largest manufacturing towns in this State, who was in the city last week, said that his usual orders for goods made for the Southern market, had been very much curtailed the present spring in consequence of the measures provoked by the abolition movements of the North, and he feared that in another season, if these movements should be continued, he should lose one of the best branches of trade that he has been engaged in. This is but one of many similar instances all over the Northern country." Boston, as we have seen it stated in the papers of that city, has lost, this season, more than a million of dollars in trade from the same cause. "What a blight would come over the workshops of New Haven should we feel the same thing here," says the article in question. Ask the tradesman of any description at the North which are his best markets, and he will tell you those of the South.

Let them see that you are conscious of the power which God and nature has given you, make them but to feel it, and hostility to the South and Southern institutions is dead forever. The sceptre of power is wrested from the hands of those who now so abuse and pervert it to their own selfish purposes, and the supremacy of the South is acknowledged and established forever. But summon the South to the rescue upon this basis, call upon her to assume this policy, it is its most potent wand. Let us once will to exercise it, and the arm now upraised to strike at the root of our institutions is palsied forever. That glorious structure, the hope of nations through every future age, concealing in embryo the liberties of nations yet unborn. That cunning policy which has already excited our people to become the tools of their own destruction, through the efforts of monarchical arts, which having already felt and seen its effects, and dreading its power and influence, are now seeking to subvert it. This noble structure against which the rotten monarchies of Europe have and ever will be battling, by the most cunning and hidden schemes imaginable, which has already half attained its end will be impregnable. Let us but pursue this measure, and those portentous clouds which now darken the hopes of the dying patriot will pass away—his eye will no more be darkened with moisture of despair—his heart will once more be gladdened, as when o'er the broad Atlantic rose the noble structure to guide and direct him, and from its pinnacle the light of liberty shed its brilliant rays like a beacon of hope through the gloomy darkness of eastern despotism. Let us for our sakes, for those of our children, for the cause of liberty throughout the world, never become the tool of despots, or the prey of treachery. Liberty and Equality—our Country and our State.—*Charleston* (*S.C.*) *Sun.*

THE RESCUE TRIALS.

TRIAL OF JAMES SCOTT.

Judge Sprague's Charge to the Jury, and Opinion upon the Constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law.

U. S. DISTRICT COURT....THURSDAY, June 5.—The Court came in at 10 o'clock. Judge Sprague stated to the jury that the indictment in this case necessarily involved the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law; that the counsel on both sides had requested him to instruct them on this point. He had found it necessary to enter somewhat into the history of the law. He had therefore committed to paper what he wished to communicate to them: and as his eye-sight was poor, would request the Clerk to read his manuscript. The Clerk then proceeded to read the Judge's opinion upon the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave law.

It does not belong to the Judiciary to decide upon the wisdom or expediency of acts of Congress. But we must of necessity decide upon their constitutionality. In doing so, however, we must remember that we are sitting in judgement upon the action of another great co-ordinate department of the government, every member of which was under oath to support the constitution. We must begin the enquiry, then, with the presumption that their legislation is rightful.

Several objections are made to the act of 1850. First, that Congress has no power to legislate upon the subject.

Second that the act does not provide for a trial by jury as required by the seventh amendment of the Constitution.

Third, that it gives to Commissioners judicial power which, by the third article of the Constitution, can be exercised only by courts of the United States held by Judges appointed by the President and Senate.

These objections apply with equal force to the statute of 1793, for

First, That was legislation by Congress.

Second it did not provide for a trial by jury.

Third, It not only authorised judges when not holding court, and out of their district, to hear the cause and grant a certificate, but also State magistrates who were not appointed by the President and Senate, and and held no office under the United States; and the certificate of such magistrate is made a sufficient warrant for the removal, and could be no more intercepted by habeas corpus or other process, than can the certificate of the Commissioner under the act of 1850.

We are under the necessity, therefore, of inquiring whether the act of 1793 be constitutional. The first objection has been solemnly and unanimously decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case where it was directly in issue, and which will hereafter be referred to.

The last two objections are those which have been most strenuously urged, and to them, therefore, I shall more particularly direct my attention. Most of the remarks, however, which I shall make, will apply with equal or greater force to the first.

These questions are not new, nor do I propose to treat them as such. Still, it may be useful to look at them for a moment, as if now presented for the first time, and afterwards to consider the contemporaneous construction of the constitution by the Statute of 1793; the practice and acquiescence under it; and the opinions and decisions of judges and courts, both State and National.

Do the proceedings prescribed by Congress for the delivery of fugitives from labor require the exercise of judicial power by a court, or may they be summary before a magistrate? If the latter only, no one contends that there must be a trial by jury.

Ever since the profound argument of Chief Justice Marshal in the House of Representatives, in the celebrated case of Jonathan Robins, more than fifty years ago, it has been the established doctrine and practice, that the delivering up a fugitive under a treaty is an executive and not a judicial proceeding. Such also has been the invariable practice in delivering up fugitives from justice under the constitution. Is not the case of a fugitive from labor to be classed with or governed by the principles of extradition? Compare this with extradition under a treaty. In both there is a claim that the person shall be delivered up as a fugitive, to be carried out of one jurisdiction into another. In both the claim is made under a law established in the one case by a treaty, and in the other by the constitution and statute. In one, the claim is made by a citizen, under an alleged right given by the law of his State; in the other, it is by an officer or agent, under an alleged authority given by his government. Thus far they are similar. But it is strongly urged that they differ in the purposes for which the delivery is made; that in the one case it is for a regular trial, and in the other as the absolute property of the claimant who may immediately exact service, and treat the prisoner in all respects as a slave. The objection derives its apparent force from confounding, or, at least, blending two sources of power, that should be kept perfectly distinct. The certificate of itself, gives no authority whatever to treat the party as a slave. It is merely a warrant to remove him to a certain place. If, while in transitu, or after the transportation, the claimant exacts service, he must find his justification, not in the certificate, but in the laws of the State where the service is required. The certificate is simply an authority for transportation, nothing more. Under this statute, therefore, as well as under a treaty, the party is delivered up, to be disposed of according to the laws of the State or country into which he is carried without any stipulation what those laws shall be, or whether proceedings shall be there instituted by the government or the individual, or in what manner the law shall be administered, or its protection obtained. In making treaties of extradition, we have confidence that the foreign nation has laws, and that they will be properly administered. So, also, the framers of the constitution, and Congress, had confidence that our sister States had laws, and that they would be fairly administered. In 1794 the laws of Great Britain, authorizing the impressment of seamen, were in full practical operation. Suppose the law of that country had authorized any officer to whom the fugitive should be delivered, at his option, to place him on board any British man-of-war, to serve indemnity as an impressed seaman, and we had known such to be her law when we made the treaty of '94, would a delivery under that treaty have ceased to be a case of extradition, because by the known law of Great Britain, the man would be subject, at the will of the person receiving him, to be reduced to practical Slavery? That such might be the fate of the alleged fugitive, might be a reason against making such a treaty, but if we chose to make it the delivery would still be extradition. The act of surrender, and the inquiries and proceedings which precede it, are the same, whether the subject be afterwards, by other laws, sent to a court of justice, or service in the navy.

The first case that arose under the treaty of 1794 was that of Jonathan Robins, above referred to. He had been guilty of murder, and mutiny on board a British frigate. Suppose that he was an impressed seamen, which is not improbable, and that the officer making the demand had informed our government, that by authority of law, he should, immediately upon receiving the fugitive place him again in the naval service from which he had escaped, and our executive had, thereupon, delivered him up, would that have changed the character of the act of delivery, or of the inquiries which preceded it? Instead of being delivered up to certain death under the laws of Great Britain, as he was, he would have been delivered up to involuntary and coerced service, on board a man-of-war at the pleasure of the commander. Still it would have been merely extradition under the treaty, the disposal of the fugitive being left to the laws of the country to which he was carried.

But even if the case of fugitives from labor be not one of extradition, still we are to inquire whether it is judicial in the sense contended for. That certain facts are to be ascertained and questions of law solved, does not render the proceeding judicial. That is to be done in all cases of delivering up fugitives from justice under the Constitution or a treaty. Magistrates also in criminal examinations must investigate and form an opinion upon questions both of law and fact, and executive officers are often obliged to do the same, and to act upon the conclusions to which they arrive. This may be illustrated by the case already referred to. Robins, the alleged fugitive, was claimed on a charge of murder and mutiny on board a British frigate. It involved very difficult and important questions of law and fact; such as his identity had he sought an asylum in this country, were the proceedings for his reclamation regular under the treaty, was the officer presenting the claim duly authorized, was the alleged act within British jurisdiction, being on the high seas was it not piracy, and to be punished in this country? These questions the President decided, with such legal advice as he chose to take, and issued his certificate or warrant for his surrender. The fugitive was soon after executed as it was foreseen he would be. But this result had no tendency to change the character of the act of extradition.

A proceeding then is not judicial merely because a magistrate or officer must ascertain facts and law and act thereon in a particular case. As a general rule to render the proceeding judicial under our jurisprudence the tribunal must have the power to render a judicial judgment as to the questions at issue, which, if not annulled by appeal or reversal, will conclude the parties in future controversy upon the same question. The matter in controversy becomes *res judicata*, judicially settled, and not open for future litigation between the same parties. It has been urged that this is not so, because after judgment upon a writ of entry the same question may again be litigated in a writ of right. This is a mistake. It is not the same question. The matters in issue in those two actions are quite different. The mere right is never in issue in a writ of entry. In a writ of entry on disseism and a plea of nul disseism, the only question is whether the defendant did disseise the plaintiff, and that being adjudged cannot be again litigated. The mere right may be afterwards tried because it is legally a different question.

In order then to determine whether the proceedings before the Commissioner are judicial, let us see what is their result. He is to grant or withhold a certificate. What is the legal force of that certificate? It is merely an authority to carry the person named from one State to another. What may be legally done with that person in the State to which he is carried, depends upon the laws of that State, and not upon anything in the certificate. It is true that the certificate states that certain facts exist, that is, in the opinion of the Commissioner. But those facts are not thereby judicially established, but may be controverted in any future proceedings between the same parties, and the certificate would not be even admissible in evidence. Neither party would be precluded from immediately contesting the same question in any other proceeding. If, for example, a suit for assault and battery and false imprisonment were brought in the Circuit Court against the claimant, for the original arrest warrant, and justification set up was that the plaintiff was a fugitive from labor, and were this question thus directly in issue, the certificate could not even be given in evidence any more than the opinion of any other person.

But it is earnestly insisted that the facts to be found in the two cases of fugitives from labor and fugitives from justice are different; that in the latter the executive has only to find that the party is charged and has fled, whereas the commissioner has to find that the party actually owed service and has fled. But it is not the nature or importance of the facts to be ascertained that makes the inquiry judicial, but that a judicial judgment may be pronounced. Suppose the law had required only that certificate should state that the fugitive was alleged or charged to owe service; would that have changed the legal character of the inquiry? It would have made the law more objectionable, but not have rendered the proceeding more or less summary. Suppose that a treaty, instead of saying that a person charged, should say that a person guilty of a crime in a foreign country should be delivered up. In such case the President must be satisfied of the party's guilt, but thereupon his action in making the surrender and the consequences that follow would be precisely the same as they now are when he has ascertained that the person is charged. So if the law requires an examining magistrate to be satisfied that the accused is guilty before he issues his warrant for his commitment. In neither case would the guilt be *res judicata*, but open to contestation in any future inquiry.

It is said that in criminal cases the person may be arrested and confined without judicial trial, because by the social compact every one has agreed that if suspected of crime he may be so dealt with. In the first place the social compact is a mere theory. In the second place it supposes an agreement to abide by all laws which society may make, civil as well as criminal, besides which, running away from labor might be made a crime.

The remark made in the opinion delivered in the case of Prigg vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 16 Peters, that a claim for a fugitive from labor was a case within the judicial power, was an obiter dictum, and can be reconciled with what was deliberately decided in the same case, only by supposing that the judge who delivered the opinion intended that Congress might legislate for it as within the judicial power, and provide for its being tried by a court, not that they must do so.

Let us next consider what is the force of the contemporaneous construction of the constitution. Here we must remember that in construing the fundamental as well as any other law, the sole inquiry is, what was the intention of those who established it? The real intention of the people who adopted the constitution is to be ascertained. If in sixty years language has been deflected, or acquired new shades of meaning, still our inquiry is, what was the sense in which it was originally used? How did those who adopted the constitution understand its language and provisions?

Had the Congress who passed the act of 1793 the means of knowing the views and intentions of those who adopted the Constitution and Amendments?

The Convention that framed the Constitution closed their labors in September, 1786. The government went into operation on the 4th of March, 1787. Nearly the whole of the intervening time, and especially of the year 1788, was spent in earnest discussions of its provisions by the people and conventions in the several States. The amendments were framed and adopted by the first Congress under the lead of Mr. Madison, and subsequently established by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. The act we are now considering was passed by the second Congress in February, 1793; that Congress met on the 24th day of October, 1791, and its members must have been elected some time previously. In 1788, therefore, when the Constitution was before the people for adoption, and subsequently when the amendments were submitted to them, every one of these members must have been of sufficient age, ability and distinction to take a prominent part in the discussion and action which preceded and attended the adoption of the constitution and amendments, and they had been selected by the very people who had adopted both, for the purpose of representing their views and intentions in carrying the Constitution into effect by practical legislation.

More than one-third of the members of the Convention which framed the Constitution were members of Congress in 1793, and a still greater portion of the members of the first Congress which adopted the amendments were also members of the second Congress when this act was passed. The act of 1793 bears the signature of Jonathan Trumbull, of Connecticut, as Speaker, of John Adams as Vice President, and George Washington as President. Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton and Henry Knox were Cabinet advisers; and among the members of Congress at that time were Caleb Strong, Elbridge Gerry, George Cabot, Fisher Ames, Theodore Sedgwick, Artemas Ward, John Langdon, Roger Sherman, Oliver Ellsworth, James Hillhouse, Rufus King, Robert Morris, James Madison and James Munroe. George Cabot was one of the Committee of the Senate which reported the bill, and it was subsequenty sent to a Committee of which Roger Sherman was also a member. Such men were members of the Congress which passed the act of 1793 as being in accordance with the Constitution.

It was immediately sent forth and put into actual practical operation amongst the same people who had so recently established the Constitution. Was it a violation of that instrument? No motion was made nor voice raised for its repeal in either house of Congress; no movement against it in any State Legislature or popular assembly; no petition or remonstrance from any source whatever. No one appears to have doubted its constitutionality, and it was received, so far at least as the public records and the history of the times show, with the general if not the universal acquiescence of the generation which adopted the Constitution. And it was not until years afterwards, and when a new generation had arisen, that its constitutionality was questioned.

It is now insisted that by this act Congress was guilty of an unauthorized assumption of power and a violation of personal liberty, by subjecting the party to a trial by an unconstitutional tribunal, and by depriving him of the right of a trial by jury as secured by the seventh amendment. How could this have happened? Was it a time of apathy and indifference? So far from it, the spirit of liberty was never higher or more vigilant in any people. They had just fought for it through a seven years' war, and endured extreme privations, sufferings and sacrifices. Apprehension of abuse of power by the national government was not only keen but almost morbid, producing the utmost vigilance and unsparing scrutiny. Let us recur to a few historical facts.

The Convention that framed the constitution closed their labors on the 17th day of September, 1787; and it was soon after submitted to the people for adoption, by conventions chosen for that purpose in the several States. The States came into it slowly and reluctantly. Eleven only acceded to it before it went into operation on the 4th of March, 1789. North Carolina and Rhode Island did not accept it until November, 1789, and May, 1790. During the whole year 1788, the question of its adoption was pending. Discussions before the people and in their conventions were able, earnest and thorough. The objections to it all arose from the apprehension that the powers conferred on the general government would be so exercised as to endanger the rights of individuals and the States. Many of the States in adopting it recommended some further guaranty for liberty, and several would not have acceded to it but for the confident assurance that amendments would be made for that purpose. In this spirit the first Congress assembled, and soon afterwards framed and adopted twelve amendments, all designed to be further securities for the rights and liberties of the people, and to make more explicit the powers of the general government. These amendments were submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for ratification. The only objection made to them was that they did not go far enough—that there should have been other and further guarantees for liberty. All but two, however, were ratified by the States, and those two related merely to the compensation of members of Congress. Ten amendments were thus adopted by Congress and the States, and among them the seventh, which, it is now insisted, was violated by the statute of 12th of February, 1793, passed only a short time afterwards.

The second Congress assembled on the 24th day of October, 1771, and most of its members must have been chosen during, or immediately after, the discussion of those amendments in the States, and as true representatives to carry out the intentions of the people in adopting them.

The spirit of the times may be still further illustrated. In this very year of 1793, exhausted as the people had been by their protracted struggle, prostrate as they were, without means, without credit, yet a large portion of them were eager to rush into the vortex of the French revolution and wage a foreign war for liberty; and it required all the wisdom, firmness and popularity of Washington himself to maintain his proclamation of neutrality, which was issued in April of that year.

Jay's treaty, made in 1794, now so universally approved, was then, from the mere apprehension of its being averse to liberty, met with the most vehement denunciation, not only by the press, but by public meetings from one end of the country to the other, and in Congress produced one of the warmest contests and most memorable debates ever known in the halls of legislation. During the administration of the elder Adams, the single case of extradition which has been referred to, that of Robbins, produced violent attacks upon the President, both in and out of Congress. The passage of the Alien and Sedition laws in 1798, intended to protect the government, were deemed assumptions of power, so dangerous to freedom as to throw the nation into a ferment and arouse State Legislatures to pass the celebrated resolutions of that year. Soon afterwards the administration was overthrown by one of the most vehement contests for political power that was ever waged, during which every measure of the government from its organization was severely scrutinized, and many of them unsparingly assailed, as invading or dangerous to the rights of the people. Yet, during all this time, and for many years afterwards, while the love of liberty was most fervid, watchful and jealous, the constitutionality of this law was never questioned.

Indeed it has been acquiesced in by the whole people for fifty-seven years, during all which time not a movement has been made in or out of Congress to repeal or impair its provisions. It has been carried into actual practical operation in most if not all of the free States which were original parties to the Constitution. In this State, one of the most remote from the slaveholding, it appears in 2d Pickering, page 11, that both my excellent and able predecessors have had occasion to give construction to the act, and there are those who recollect that Judge Davis, so justly revered for wisdom and benevolence, in several instances delivered up slaves pursuant to its provisions. This he did, not by holding a court, for no entry or record was made, and no decree of judgment entered up, but acting as a judge or magistrate, summarily granted a certificate which was merely a warrant to convey the person to a certain place and then, being *functus officio*, had no further legal efficacy.

The intention of those who adopted the constitution must govern. It is their views which we are endeavoring to ascertain, and to that end what can be more satisfactory than such contemporaneous exposition, such practice and acquiescence of the fathers of the constitution, and all those who participated in its adoption, and their successors for more than half a century.

Those who, impressed only with the feelings of the present time, find it difficult to believe that our fathers in the North could have intended to render persons of color liable to be carried out of the State as slaves without trial by jury, and with a hearing only before a magistrate, will find it useful to go back to the period when the constitution was established and see the actual condition of things at that time. Then all States, with the exception of Massachusetts, were to a greater or less extent slaveholding, and in this State it had been abolished only eight years before by her Bill of Rights. Connecticut and Rhode Island had in 1784 passed laws looking to its ultimate extinction by providing that children born after that time should be free. All the men of that day had been born in the midst of that institution and had been accustomed to its practical operation. Runaway negroes were taken back to their masters, generally, it is believed, by mere recaption without legal process, certainly without trial by jury or formal protracted proceedings before a court of record.

Massachusetts ratified the Constitution on the 7th of February, 1788. She was the only free State, and the views and purposes of this Commonwealth with respect to negroes coming from other States are shown by a statute passed by her on the 26th day of March of the same year, that is, within fifty days of her adoption of the Constitution. That act is as follows:

Section 6. "*Be it further enacted, &c.*, That no person being an African or Negro, other than a subject of the Emperor of *Morocco*, or a citizen of some one of the United States, (to be evidenced by a certificate from the Secretary of the State of which he shall be a citizen,) shall tarry within this Commonwealth for a longer time than two months; and, upon complaint made to any Justice of the Peace within this Commonwealth, that any such person has been within the same more than two months the said Justice shall order the said person to depart out of this Commonweelth; and in case the said African or Negro shall not depart, as aforesaid, any Justice of the Peace within this Commonwealth, upon complaint and proof made that such person has continued within this Commonwealth ten days after notice given him or her to depart as aforesaid, shall commit the said person to any house of correction within the county, there to be kept to hard labor agreeably to the rules and orders of the said house until the Sessions of the Peace, next to be holden within and for the said county; and the master of the said house of correction is hereby required and directed to transmit an attested copy of the warrant of commitment to the said Court on the first day of their said session; and if, upon trial at the said Court, it shall be made to appear that the said person has thus continued within the Commonwealth contrary to the tenor of this Act, he or she shall be whipped, not exceeding ten stripes, and ordered to depart out of this Commonwealth within ten days; and if he or she shall not so depart, the same process shall be had and punishment inflicted, and so *toties quoties*."

Thus it appears that Massachusetts at that time made all negroes from other States, whether bond or free, unless the prescribed certificate of citizenship was produced, liable after remaining here two months, and a notice of ten days to be sent by a single magistrate to the house of correction to hard labor until the next General Sessions of the Peace, which was held by Justices of the Peace, and then liable to be sentenced by that court to punishment by whipping, and ordered out of the State; and if this order were disobeyed the same confinement in the house of correction and punishment by stripes might again be inflicted, and for every successive neglect of ten days to obey the order to depart from the State, the same proceeding might be repeated indefinitely. The reason why a certificate of citizenship protected the holder from being thus dealt with was doubtless because the constitution which she had just before sanctioned, declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Verily, since the year 1788, when the Constitution was adopted, we of Massachusetts and the North have undergone a change, but this cannot altar the pre-existing facts. If from the progress of benevolence we have acquired a stronger sympathy for the African, a more zealous desire to aid and protect him, our change cannot retroact so as to change the views and intentions which actually existed at the time the Constitution was adopted.

Let us now examine the opinions and decisions of Courts and Judges, State and National.

The State Courts have, in several instances affirmed, and in no one denied the constitutionality of the act of 1794. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, with Chief Justice Tilghman at its head in the case of Wright vs. Deacon, 5 Serg. and Rawle 62, after full consideration decided that the act of 1793 was constitutional, that the party claimed as a fugitive was not entitled to a trial by jury, but the proceedings were to be summary, and that the certificate of a State Judge pursuant to the act authorized the removal, and could not be intercepted by process from the State Court, and a writ *de homine replegiando* which had issued under the State Law was quashed. Here the authority of the State Magistrate and the legal effect of his certificate were directly in issue and the pivot on which the decision turned. This was in 1819, more than thirty years nearer to the adoption of the constitution than the present.

The next case was that of Commonwealth vs. Griffith, 2 Pick. 11. This was an indictment for assault and battery and false imprisonment against an agent who had seized a fugitive slave in order to carry him before a magistrate pursuant to the statute. The court unanimously affirmed the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject, and the constitutionality of the act of 1793. But Thacher, J. thought that by the true construction of the act, a warrant to arrest was required. The purpose of the arrest was to carry him before a magistrate pursuant to the statute, yet the constitutional authority of the magistrate was not discussed or questioned. This was in the year 1823.

In Jack. vs. Martin, 12, Wendell 311, a certificate had been given by the Recorder of the city of New York. A writ *de homine replegiando* was afterwards sued out. Several questions arose, and among them this question of the authority of the State magistrate. The Supreme Court of New York in their opinion delivered by Nelson, J., page 328, use this language. "The question of slave or not, according to the laws of the State from whence the fugitive fled, belonged to the magistrate under the law of Congress to decide, and his decision is conclusive in the matter so far as the State Courts are concerned." And again, page 329: "The decision of the magistrate and certificate, is conclusive upon the fact as to the State Court." This was in 1834. This case was carried to the Court of Errors, where an opinion against the constitutionality of the act of 1793 was delivered by Mr. Chancellor Walworth, but it does not appear that any other member of the Court concurred with him.

In Sims' case before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in April last, these very questions of the power of the Commissioner, the right of a trial by jury, and the right of Congress to legislate, were zealously argued and fully considered, and the constitutionality of the act of 1850 unanimously affirmed. The very able opinion of the Court, delivered by Chief Justice Shaw, is so recent that it need only be referred to. The same result is ably sustained by the opinion of Mr. Commissioner Curtis in the same case.

Let us next look at the opinions and decisions of Judges and Courts of the United States. In ex parte Simmons in the year 1823, 4 Wash. C. C. R. 396, Mr. Justice Washington of the Supreme Court heard an application under the act of 1793, out of Court summarily, without any question of its Constitutionality. He refused the certificate on the ground that the alleged fugitive was free.

In Hill *vs.* Low, 4 Wash. C. C. R., 327, which was error from the District Court, the constitutionality of the act of 1793, and the right of the State magistrate to grant a certificate, seemed to have been conceded without question, the points raised being only as to the construction of the act.

So in Worthington *vs.* Preston, 4 Wash. C. C. R., 461, where a certificate had been granted by a State magistrate no question was raised as to the constitutionality of the act of 1793, but other grounds of defence were successfully relied on. See also Johnson *vs.* Tompkins, 1 Baldwin's R., 579. and Jones *vs.* Vanzant, 2 McLean's C. C. R., 596 and 611.

Judge Story, in his work upon the Constitution, vol. 3d, page 677, referring to the fourth article, says: "It is obvious that these provisions for the arrest and removal of fugitives of both classes contemplate summary ministerial proceedings, and not the ordinary course of judicial investigations, to ascertain whether the complaint be well founded, or the claim of ownership be established beyond all legal controversy."

We now come to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in Prigg vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the year 1842—16 Peters, page 559. In this case the Court emphatically affirm the act of 1793. In the opinion of the Court, as delivered by Mr. Justice Story, page 622, we find the following decisive language: "We hold the act to be clearly constitutional in all its leading provisions, and, indeed with the exception of that part which confers authority upon State magistrates, to be free from reasonable doubt and difficulty upon the grounds already stated. As to the authority so conferred upon State magistrates, while a difference of opinion has existed, and may exist still on the point in different States, whether State magistrates are bound to act under it; none is entertained by this Court that State magistrates may, if they choose, exercise that authority, unless prohibited by State legislation."

The question of the power of Congress to legislate, was an essential and turning point in the cause. It is true that the question of the power of the State Magistrate to act summarily was not necessarily raised by the record, but the Court nevertheless purposely and deliberately decided it. What they say is not to be classed among obiter dicta. It was not thrown *in arguendo* as tending to the conclusion to which they had arrived, but is itself a conclusion which they take that occasion to pronounce, and mean to establish by all the authority of the Court. In this all the judges seem to have concurred. Mr. Justice McLean, in a separate opinion given by him, held that State magistrates were not only constitutionally authorized, but bound to act under the statute. Since that decision was pronounced; there have been three changes in the members of the Court, all in the Free States, Justices Grier, Nelson and Woodbury, having succeeded Justices Baldwin, Thompson and Story.

In the case of Garnett brought as a fugitive before Judge Grier, at Philadelphia, in October last, he expressed his determination in the strongest manner to enforce the act of 1850. Its constitutionality was not discussed. A letter subsequently written by Judge Grier holds this language: "A person held as a fugitive under the certificate of a judge or magistrate under this act is legally imprisoned under process from a court or magistrate having jurisdiction." And, again, "Those who believe that the constitution and laws of their country should be regarded and obeyed have no ground of complaint." Here the constitutionality of the act is assumed as unquestioned.

Judge Nelson, in a charge to the Grand Jury, in March last, takes occasion in very decided language to affirm the constitutionality of the act of 1850, without exception. Mr. Justice Woodbury has also expressed his concurrence in those views.

We have thus not only the decision of the highest judicial tribunal in the United States, which alone would be conclusive upon all subordinate courts, but the opinion of all the members of the Court in 1842, and all its present members in support of the constitutionality of the act. Against all this not one decision of any court, State or National, and not one opinion of any Judge of the United States can be produced.

These questions must now be considered as settled by contemporaneous exposition, by practice, and acquiescence, for more than fifty years, by the opinions and decisions of courts and judges, State and National, and especially by the Supreme Court of the United States. To overturn the construction of the constitution so established, would be a most dangerous violation of principle and duty. If a court may do this it may overturn established rules of property of personal rights, and of evidence upon which the community have for a long time acted, and thus shake every man's title, put in jeopardy every man's liberty, and render the law so uncertain that no counsel could advise, and no man act with safety.

The Judge then proceeded with an extemporaneous charge to the Jury. He explained the necessity of the questions propounded to each juror before taking the oath to serve upon the panel. They did not volunteer their services, but were compelled to appear under the process of the Court. They were required to try the case by the law and the evidence presented in the Court, and not by any law which they may have received elsewhere. It would not be reasonable or just then to compel men to come here and swear to try a cause against their own conscientious views. Hence the questions referred to.

He said it was the duty of the Court to pronounce the law, and that of the jury to decide the case by such law and the evidence and nothing else. He then added, "It is my duty, gentlemen, to say to you, in the most decided terms, that the Fugitive Slave Law is unconstitutional." He explained why there was so many counts in the indictment, viz., to meet objections which might be raised by the defence to destroy the charge made. Of the sixteen counts, thirteen are under the law of 1850; the last three come under the law of 1790.

The learned counsel for defence contended that the Government should prove that the person owing service and labor, referred to in the act of 1850, owed such service up to the time of the rescue. He (the Judge) adopted this construction. Under the thirteen first counts of the indictment it would therefore be impossible for the jury to find a verdict of guilty against defendant, unless they were satisfied beyond a doubt, from the evidence, that Shadrach at the time of the rescue was the slave of Debree.

The last three counts under the law of 1790 has reference to the holding of prisoners by officers, and the punishment for rescuing such prisoner while legally held by that officer. Shadrach was legally held. It matters not whether he was a slave or not. The marshal's duty was to hold him until by a due process of law it was ascertained that he was innocent of the crime charged. Did Shadrach owe service? A prayer has been put in by the the defence for instruction as to color. It was true that by the law of Virginia, a person of Shadrach's color would be free; evidence must therefore exist upon this point.

It had been objected that in a case of liberty and Slavery, possession was not conclusive evidence against the party sueing for freedom. However, that was in a case where one person sues for his liberty, it was not the case here. Shadrach is no party in this proceeding. Shadrach, after the decision of this case, has still the right to sue for his liberty. The verdict will not effect his liberty one way or the other.

If Debree and Caphart's testimony is to be believed, there being no evidence on the other side to conflict with it, then Shadrach was a slave. That he was a fugitive from service and labor while in this State, must be judged of by the fact that there was no evidence that he was emancipated or transported. He therefore owed service at the time of the rescue.

Judge Sprague then reviewed the testimony, drawing from the probability of his escape.

Did Scott engage in the rescue? Here the Judge instructed the jury not to heed the declarations put in by the Government to affect his case, where he was not proved to be connected. They were unauthored by the defendant and hence should not affect his case.

The Judge, in reviewing the testimony of witnesses, said Byrnes character had been assailed; but he should not go into it at all, leaving the jury to judge of that themselves.

In conclusion, the judge instructed that if the jury were satisfied that the thirteen first counts were sustained by the evidence that Shadrach did owe service to Debree, and escaped to this State, and that Scott did aid in the rescue, they would find him guilty; and in regard to the three last counts it was immaterial whether Shadrach was a slave or not, as the charge was of obstructing the execution of legal process in the hands of an officer. If it was made out beyond a reasonable doubt in their minds that Scott did so obstruct this process, they would find him guilty under the three last counts.

The papers in the case were then delivered to the jury, and at a quarter past twelve they retired to their rooms.

Mr. Hayden's case comes on this morning at half-past nine o'clock. A new Jury will try this case. Hon. John P. Hale and R. H. Dana, Jr., counsel for defence.

SIMS.

The statement we made last week, on the authority of newspaper paragraphs, that Sims had been sent to Cuba, a sort of anticipatory evidence of the advantages of a Union which he has already been made an unwilling instrument in saving, is denied. The *Evening Post* publishes the following letter to correct the impression which it in common with others, had helped create:

A gentleman from the North tells me that he called a few days since at the slave pen and was informed by the keeper that Sims was there, that he could not get an offer for him, or sell him at any price; that his being so long free and at the North had spoiled him, and no slave owner was willing to risk him among their negroes. The same gentleman also ascertained that Potter, his master, had had him severely whipped for betraying his confidence, and had kept him in the slave pen ever since his return, and has determined that nothing but death should release him from Slavery, and that he should stay in that pen until he could be sold to a buyer who would give a heavy bond that he should never be returned, under any circumstances, to a free land.

Potter is trying to sell him to some planter in the interior, where the worst class of negroes are sent, from whence escape is impossible, and where labor is high, from the increased risk of life. They have a sale monthly at the pen of all the refuse negroes, and it is expected that he will be put up with those, at the next sale, which I believe comes off on the first Tuesday of next month, when Sims will probably have a new master at some price. He cannot suffer much by a change of master, for Potter is a man of very low nature, lazy, and insensible, as you may imagine, to any emotion of pity or even of common humanity, or he would have not beaten this fellow for a successful effort to obtain the freedom which, when obtained, he used so well; nor would he now refuse to accept the price of Sims, from those who would assist in restoring him to his freedom.

—This statement seems to be in the main true, though it has called forth another letter to the *Tribune* asserting Mr. Potter to be a very humane and excellent gentleman, and Sims to be a very bad man for running away from one so very good; though this last fact, to-be-sure, we knew before; tho slaves never do run away from bad masters. We copy this letter also to show what a hard time of it this poor Mr. Potter has always had with this impracticable Sims family. The ingratitude of Mrs. Sims in not giving up all her huckster money to her master is particularly deserving of reprehension:

THE SLAVE SIMS AND HIS OWNER.

To the Editor of the New York Tribune:

In your paper of to-day (June 4,) on the subject of the Sims slave case, you give an extract from a letter to the *Evening Post*, purporting to have been written at Savannah, May 26th, and which contains so foul a libel upon the character of James Potter, the owner of "Sims," and which so grossly misstates facts, that I am sure your sense of justice will allow me to correct the same through the medium of your columns.

I am a northern man, with strong northern dislike of Slavery, but spending some weeks at Savannah, I became incidentally acquainted with Mr. Potter, with his character, and with his management of his slaves. I assure you that the assertion in the letter alluded to, that he "*is a man of very low nature, lazy and insensible to any emotion of pity or even of common humanity*," is a gross slander. Mr. James Potter is a high-minded, humane, honorable man, and it is his extreme kindness and leniency to his slaves, which has caused him a great amount of trouble. On the recovery of Sims, he caused him to be kept in jail to prevent any further attempts to escape, and the statement that he had him "severely whipped," is unqualifiedly false. In a conversation with Mr. Potter, within a few days, he informed me that he wished to get rid of Sims; that he had a great deal of trouble with that whole family, but that he would only part with him to a good man. The Sims family, consisting of a mother and four or five sons and daughters, were the property of Mrs. Potter, now deceased, and in consequence of this Mr. P. has always treated them with great kindness and consideration. He caused the sons to learn trades, but when their trades were learned they refused to work at them, and instead of compelling them to labor on his plantations, Mr Potter has allowed them to choose their own place of residence, and for many years he has realized little or nothing from them. A brother of the fugitive Sims he recently sold for $600, to a man who is to give him an opportunity to purchase his own freedom, when he could have got $900 for him if sold to an indifferent purchaser. The mother of this family is now virtually the slave of Mr. Potter, but she does not pay him anything for her time, although making money as a market woman in the city of Savannah. He recently informed her that all he ever would ask of her was to do his marketing.

The plain truth of the matter is, that Mr. Potter is considered by all his neighbors as too lenient with his slaves, giving them, when he has anything to do with them, too much liberty and indulging them too much. They often take unwarrantable advantage of his good nature, and will do little or nothing for him. This has, in particular, been the case with the Sims family; for had Sims been in the hands of a hard master, he never would have been allowed the opportunity of running away.

The facts which I have mentioned are within my own knowledge, and I trust you will not allow any prejudice against Slavery to do injustice to a kind and generous man, who happens to have the misfortune (as we deem it) to be a slaveholder.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be fowarded to* Francis Jackson, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1851.

THE UNITARIAN CLERGY AND SLAVERY

The old story of the Bishop, who palliated the commission of some peccadillo on the score that he was acting as a private man and not in his clerical capacity, has found a new application in the assumed position of the Unitarian Clergy last week at Boston. The clerical members of the Association indulge in the luxury of a private conscience quite distinct from that which they obey in their official capacity. As an associated body, they conceive they have no right to express any opinion upon an act of the Government which, as individual men, they are almost unanimous in regarding as a flagrant outrage upon the rights of man, and a gross violation of Christian precept and practice. The Democratic idea, that the citizen is not merely a subject, but, that being the fountain of power and authority, is responsible in every relation of life for their proper exercise, appears to be as little regarded by some of those clergymen as it is throughout the country by those who are supposed to look to the clergy for moral guidance. When the politician shall have established it as an indisputable truth that the citizen has no right of private judgment upon the acts of the Government, and the clergy succeed in persuading their flocks that religion has nothing to do with men's civil relations, we have as good a theory of despotism accepted as even slaveholders can ask for. But lest we should seem, for a moment, to be unjust, we commend to the reader the following report of the remarks of the Unitarian Clergymen at their Ministerial Conference last week in that city, as reported in the *Boston Commonwealth*:

Slavery Discussions at the Unitarian Ministerial Conference.—One of the most interesting meetings of anniversary week was that of the above Society on Thursday morning, at the Bedford street chapel, when, several topics having been submitted for discussion, by general consent, that referring to Slavery as embraced by the resolutions offered the previous day at the session of the American Unitarian Association, [see the last number of the *Standard*,] by Rev. Mr. May, of Syracuse, N. Y. was taken up. Rev. Dr. Farley, of Brooklyn, N. Y., presided.

Rev. Mr. Judd, of Augusta, Me., thought it the duty of the clergy to speak freely upon the question of Slavery, but with perfect plainness to all parties. He approved of the sentiment of the resolve, but disliked the preamble as too personal in its language.

Rev. Mr. May, of Syracuse, N. Y., said reference was made in the resolve to those only whom the Conference had a right to mention, viz. prominent Unitarians who had sustained the Fugitive Slave Law.

Rev Dr. Hall, of Providence, R. I., thought that, as citizens, as Unitarians and as Christians they were called upon to speak in opposition to the law, but the right place should be selected, in order that no false impression should be given in case the topic should not be acted upon. He deprecated all false statements, whether from the press the pulpit or the bench, in regard to the disloyalty of the public and believed that the cause of truth and justice and sound law derived no benefit from such utterances. For himself he should not obey the law though the country went to pieces.

Rev Mr. Parker, of Boston, read extracts from an English paper, showing the action of an ecclesiastical body abroad that had resolved not to countenance or admit to its pulpits any of the American clergy who upheld the Fugitive Slave Law or Slavery.

Rev. Mr. Holland, of Portland, N. Y., deemed obeyance to the law a violation of conscience and duty. His voice and prayer was for progress and liberty.

Rev. Mr. Frost, of Concord, Mass, had had a committee of his Society ask him to abstain from preaching on Slavery thenceforth. He replied that when the slave-power had taken possession of the departments of government, controlled the decisions of our Courts, and influenced the moral position of the Church itself, glossing over all the iniquities of the system, he should not keep silence. Obedience to the fugitive law was treason to God; he preferred to be disloyal to man.

Rev. Mr. Channing, of New York city, thought the Church should take common ground against this national sin. But to the slaveholder he would be fair and candid. He would meet him in conclave, show him the evils of Slavery, the worth of freedom, and join with him in removing the willing colored population to the lands of the West, and as a remuneration give him the blessings of free labor and social prosperity.

Rev. Mr. Osgood, of New York city, admitted the iniquity of the Fugitive Slave Law, and the sin of Slavery, and thought them proper subjects for pulpit discussion; but he wanted a moral influence to be exerted without a violation of Christian gentleness. He said Rev. Mr Furness, of Phila., and Rev. Dr. Dewey, of New York, had had a correspondence in reference to the latter's position on political questions, and he (Mr. O.) honestly believed from the results of that correspondence, and from conversations he himself had held with the Dr., that, in his support of the Slave Law, he was making a self-sacrifice to what he conceived his duty. He (Mr. O.) was authorized by Dr. Dewey to say that the oft-quoted expression that he (Dr. D.) "would sell his *own mother* into Slavery rather than have the law violated" was an exaggeration; that the only expression he used was that he *himself* would rather be sold into Slavery, &c.

Rev. Mr. Shackford, of Lynn, was willing to testify in a court of law that in a lecture he attended, Dr. Dewey had said he would sell his *own mother* into Slavery rather than the contingencies he mentioned should happen.

Rev. Mr. Waterston, of Boston, said he heard Dr. Dewey make the remark before the Mercantile Library Association of this city, that he would sell his *own son* rather, &c. The sentiment was received with applause by the audience, but it touched his heart with sadness, seeming to him one of the most atrocious declarations to which he ever listened; and he went home with his regard for the Dr. very much modified.

Rev Mr. Pierpont, of Medford, proclaimed the superiority of God's law to man's law. He would not obey the latter when it interfered with the former. The government might fine and imprison, but it could do no more; he was mindful of the penalty, but he would not obey. If all would act with him, the law would fail of being executed.

Rev. Dr. Gannett, of Boston, was impressed with the immensity of this question, the terrible awfulness that lay behind it, and he would discuss it with all solemnity and seriousness in view of the impending evil. He believed in his heart the maintenance of government, the comfort of the people, and the perpetuity of our Union depended on the support of the Fugitive Law. He would not have the subject treated lightly, but prayerfully, fearfully, in view of the great responsibilities resting upon it. We should respect private convictions and allow the integrity of motives of those who differed with us.

Rev. Mr. Ellis, of Charlestown, hailed that day as the first when these differences had been rightly discussed. But if the Conference comprising members of different, though honest views, should take ground on this question, he should leave it. As an organized body we have nothing to do with it. No action could be binding, and he was unwilling to have the Conference interfere with the question. He had himself ever entertained ultra abolition views, and did now; but he had no such fears for the Union as Bro. Gannet. If the Union was held together by so feeble a tenure as he had represented, he thought it was not worth saving; and further, if our northern land is to be the scouring ground of slavehunters the sooner the Union was sundered the better. But our sphere of action did not allow interference with the question.

Rev. Mr. Parker, of Boston, had to thank the last two brothers for their counsel, but he could remember occasions when only mere speculative and theological, not practical, differences existed, and when non-interference and belief in integrity were needed, and it was not to be had. He begged to remind them of these occasions. He himself was no non-resistant—he believed not in such nonsense—and when, therefore, his parishioners were sought after, to be sent back to the hell of Slavery by a parishioner of Bro. Gannett (Geo. T. Curtis), he took them home to his house; from its place on the wall in his study was taken the well-used musket with which his grandfather did service at Lexington; beneath his table lay the sword that in ancestral hands won honors in the period of the Revolution; beside his desk, all ready for use, were pistols, trophies of the April contest at Concord;—and with these about him, and the Word of God open before him, and his flying parishioners sheltered by him, he had prayed his God to give him strength to resist the operation of that law, at whatever sacrifice and whatever cost. He wished he could believe with his brother from New York, who had apologized for Dr. Dewey, but he could not.

Rev. Mr. May, of Syracuse, N. Y., had known Mr. Wm. L. Garrison long and well. He was conversant with his early efforts in behalf of emancipation, and knew of his addressing letters to prominent divines, jurists and statesmen on the evils of Slavery. A more religious or conscientious man than Mr. G. there never lived. The indifference of the individuals whom he sought to enlist in the Anti-Slavery Cause—so that he himself might return to his profession of a printer—while it was as inexplicable as it was painful to his soul, also fired within him the determination to make himself heard for the slave. He established the *Liberator*; he proclaimed that he would be as severe as truth; and from that moment was turned against him all the vials of wrath. If Mr. Garrison was denunciatory, he had provocation; if he was an altered man, it was owing to his treatment.

Messrs. Judd, Pierpont and Gannett severally explained. The former thought that the English Synod did wrong in excluding American ministers from their pulpits; he would allow anybody to preach from his, who would do so in the name of the Father and the Son. Mr. Pierpont defined a little more fully his position in regard to the Fugitive Law. Mr. Gannett spoke of the character of that parishioner of his who had returned a slave (Curtis). He had done so from convictions of his constitutional obligations, as an upholder of law, and as a good citizen, and as he esteemed that a wrong was done him in stigmatizing him as a "cruel" man, because of that return, as the resolution expressed it.

On motion of Mr. Pierpont, therefore, the word "cruel" was stricken out, and the resolution having previously been altered so as to make it a proposition for discussion, rather than as a test for votes, it was entered upon the records as follows:

"We, the Unitarian Ministerial Conference, earnestly exhort all who would honor the Christian name, but especially all who have embraced with us views of Human Nature similar to those held up by our revered Channing, to remember those in bonds as bound with them; ever to attempt to do for them as we would that the now enslaved or fugitive should do for us in an exchange of circumstances to comfort and aid them in their attempts to escape from their oppressors and by no means to betray the fugitives, or in any way assist or give the least countenance to the men who would return them to Slavery."

The debate (of which we have given a very limited sketch) here terminated by general consent, the feeling being almost unanimous as expressed by the majority of the speakers.

—Whether this is the expression of deliberate and sincere opinion and determination on the part of these clergymen, or whether something of the warmth and earnestness of the debate may be attributed to the natural reaction of the pro-slavery regimen to which they condemned themselves the day before, we may, in either case, rejoice at it. We might, with some amusement to ourselves, if not to the edification of others, find food for comment in the remarks of some of the speakers,—such, for instance, as the ultra Abolitionism of Mr. Ellis, and his remarkable success in concealing it for so long a time, from his parishioners and friends; —or the awkward and mortifying position of Mr. Osgood in permitting himself to be used to make a statement which was pronounced on the spot by two of his clerical brethren to be a falsehood; but we let these little matters pass, and rejoice unfeignedly that such is the spirit of the Unitarian clergy. We are bound however, to state, explicitly, as we have already intimated, that we are listening in this debate to the voice of the private conscience, and are cognizant of the sense of private duty of these gentlemen. They all, with a single exception, avowed their condemnation of Slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law, but some of them, at least, intended to be understood rather in a Pickwickian sense; it was a private conference; what was said was said in private; and we cannot therefore draw any conclusion as to what is considered the course of duty on this subject by the Unitarian clergy as a body.—The *Tribune* of a day or two ago contains the following note:

THE UNITARIAN CONFERENCE IN BOSTON.

To the Editors of The Tribune:

Gentlemen; I read with surprise in *The Tribune* of this morning an article from the *Boston Commonwealth* pretending to be a report of the proceedings of the Conference of Unitarian Ministers, held last week in Boston. I am prevented from correcting the numerous errors in the article by the fact that the meeting was a private conference of brethren and nothing but gross intrusion could have led any person to attempt to report remarks entirely colloquial in their character, for the columns of a secular paper, when our own denominational organs do not feel authorized to use any such liberty.

If you care to lay before your readers a just idea of the tenor of the meeting in question, you will find an article on the subject in *The Christian Inquirer* of this week, which gives the impressions of many members of the Conference, as well of Yours respectfully,

New York, June 6, 1851. Saml. Osgood.

—We turned to the columns of the *Inquirer* with some curiosity, though with some regret, not being willing to lose so soon the pleasant impression left by the reading of the *Commonwealth's* report. The offence of that paper, however, seems to be that it reported at all, and not that it reported *incorrectly*, for the *Inquirer's* statement merely confirms the impression which a reading of the report creates. We copy that portion of the article which refers to this debate. It was written evidently before Mr. Osgood was aware that any secular paper was beforehand with its own:

To us the crowning satisfaction of the week was the Ministerial Conference. It was indeed a communion of brethren. The division of services worked *admirably*, and the theological session and the reform session were each remarkable in its way.....Now, then, among brethren, und with no gazing crowd to interfere with entire freedom of remark, we launched out into unreserved discussion of the most exciting and perplexing topic in the Church and nation. Men spoke warmly and kindly, and, we believe, generally wisely—all the more so from the absence of every attempt to force any votes or resolutions calculated to put brethren into a false position. It was very obvious that our clergy, as a body, generally agree in their opposition to the institution of Slavery, and that with few exceptions on each extreme, they agree in regard to the course to be pursued in the present crisis. They are as little disposed to favor anarchical movements as to acquiesce in servility to absolutism. They take the reasonable and well tried grounds of peaceful nonconformity, whenever called to act in opposition to conscience. With most of us conscience forbids our aiding in sending any human being into bondage without charge of crime. We would show our respect for social order in the manner of our protest against any offensive law, and claim that a decent respect for the acknowledged principles of civil and religious liberty should have induced the framers of said law to insert a clause, releasing from its penalties all persons bound in conscience against complying with its demands....We claim this exemption, just as the Friends claim to be exempt from bearing arms in war. Our clergy are wrongly accused of treasonable agitation, and we know not a single one of them who has recommended violent measures. One preacher, indeed, who retains our name, widely as he differs from our general theological views, has declared that he prepared to resist the law by force in a single case, but he denies that he urged the same course upon others. We feel as little bound to apologize for the violence of his conduct, as we did for the offensive and unwarrantable strain of his last published discourse.....We have not felt at liberty to report any remarks made at the Ministerial Conference, but have spoken freely of its spirit.

—Of the impropriety of which the *Commonwealth* was guilty in reporting what was only a private conversation among private gentlemen, we have not a word to say in defence; but as those gentlemen happen to be in important and influential public positions, we cannot help rejoicing that that paper's breach of good manners has acquainted us with the important fact, that whatever their public position has hitherto been on the subject of slave-catching, their private opinion and determination is of no uncertain character. We sincerely hope that nobody but Mr. Osgood is offended at this discovery of their humane feeling and that the Unitarian clergy-*men*, and the Unitarian clergy will soon see the way open to express a public unity.

A SLAVEHOLDER'S LETTER.

There is in Manchester, England, says the *Manchester Examiner*, a colored man who, some years since escaped from servitude in Maryland, and settled in Pennsylvania. There he found employment, maintained himself respectably, and was enabled in the course of a few years to lay by enough of his earnings to purchase a cottage. But the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law brought sorrow and trouble to his door, as it has to hundreds of homes in all the Northern States. He was threatened with arrest and fled, leaving behind him a wife and an aged mother.

He found his way to Manchester, and is there also earning a decent livelihood; but being anxious to rejoin his wife and mother, and knowing that he can better his circumstances if permitted to return home, he opened a correspondence with his former master that he might purchase the privilege of again living in his own country without being liable to be reduced again to Slavery under the infamous Constitution and law of the Union. The *Examiner* publishes the letter of the slaveowner in reply to the application and offer of his former bondmen, and we do not recollect to have seen lately a more proof evidence of how completely the sense of justice and mercy is absolutely obliterated from the mind of a slaveholder where a slave is concerned. Such a letter might strike one at first as the very height of cool impudence, and a disregard of the rights of a human being amounting to wilful atrocity. But in truth it is not so. This man, we have no doubt, would scorn to pick a white man's pocket; we dare say he is not in the habit of beating his wife, or his grown-up daughters, if he has any; he probably would not hang up two cats together by the tail, or starve a horse to death for punishment, or skin any warm-blooded animal alive for his amusement. Yet we see he is anxious to rob this poor fellow, and avers his determination to stop at nothing to effect that object; and we are doing him no sort of injustice in presuming that he would gladly stand by and see Benjamin Chisly scourged till he stood in a puddle of his own blood, and that no feeling of compunction would ever visit the insensible heart of the slaveholder should he separate, as he wishes to do, this unoffending man forever from the wife of his bosom and the mother that bore him. That a man can be made *thus* towards his fellow-man is the feature of Slavery that most appals us. Here is the letter:

"Prince Frederick Island, April 14, 1851.

"Mr. Benjamin C. Chisly.—Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 14th ult. I must confess that I do not know which feeling predominated—surprise or gratification. As strange as it may appear to you, I was grateful to hear from you at all; and more so to see that you had some respect for the country you have left. I have no doubt but you feel a wish to live in the country of your birth. Though your lot was cast, as many of your color has been (in servitude), it is true that for nearly seven years you have enjoyed a degree of freedom, which would now, no doubt, make servitude irksome; but you must confess that your mind has not been free from apprehensions that you might be caught and brought again to service, and especially since the passing of the Fugitive Slave Bill by the Congress of the United States, and the treaty entered into between Great Britain and the United States to deliver up any person that may owe allegiance to the other country. But to come to particulars, your letter was written for the ostensible purpose of offering me a sum of money for your freedom, which, if granted, would relieve your mind from further apprehensions. The sum you offer is fifteen pounds English money (about 66 dollars); just about the sum you would have for one year. The reason you assign for offering me that amount is, that it is as much as you can save for that purpose; that you only get fifteen shillings a week. Now supposing you had been in England, and receiving that amount from the time you left me, would you not be able to offer or pay more than that sum? You have been gone for seven years next July, and have been in this country up to last summer, for I heard a gentleman say that knew you well, that he saw you in Boston about that time; and from what I know of your industrious habits and economy, I know that instead of 66 odd dollars, which you offer as the amount which you are able to pay, you are able to pay a thousand dollars for your freedom if I were to ask it. I do not ask that amount, however, but I do ask five hundred dollars, and that to be paid before I ever sign any papers that will guarantee to you what you want; and for that purpose, I have declared that you may, if you choose, come to the United States for the purpose of making arrangements to raise the money, or of paying it yourself, which I know you have; but if you have not the money yourself, I know that you can raise it in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, in three days after you get there, and that you may then send an agent to Baltimore, which I will meet, if addressed in time to do so, on any day that he may appoint, and will then and there execute a deed of manumission or bill of sale, as you may desire, with this condition, that you are not to come to Maryland, which I need not make, as the laws of Maryland forbid free persons of color from coming into the State from other States to live. This privilege of coming to the United States without my interfering with you, or molesting you in any way, I most solemnly declare I will extend to you, if you choose to accept of it, until June, and will extend it to July, if you wish it, for the purpose of affording you ample time for raising the money, but not longer. This arrangement, if you choose to accept it, will forever release your mind from further apprehensions; and I most sincerely declare that I will, on my part, perform the above conditions; but should you not accept of this my proposition, then I am sure you will not think hard of me when I assure you that I will accept of no other, and will use my best exertions to bring you to servitude again. I would say, however, in conclusion, that if you would like to return home to live, I will forget and forgive the past, and treat you kindly as I know how; but I must say, that I prefer the proposition which I have made you above. Yours most respectfully,

"Robt. W. Roe."

"P. S. You will be kind enough to answer this, and let me know your intentions in regard to the matter contained in the letter.—Yours. "R. W. R."

GEORGE THOMPSON IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. Thompson was to lecture in Chester and Norristown, Pa., last week, and we presume did, though we have heard nothing of the meetings. We learn from the *Philadelphia Bulletin* that he was announced to lecture in Arch street Hall, on Sunday, but the agent of the Hall refused to permit him to use it. Notice was then given that the meeting would be held in Delavan Hall, Cherry street, to which the crowd advanced, but Mr. Thompson was not present, probably because a riot was apprehended.

Mr. Thompson sails next week for England, but is expected to return again in the autumn, when probably the Cause will again have the benefit of his invaluable services.

DOMESTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT

NO. LXXXI.

The Argument.—*The New England Convention.—The Speakers—The Fleas—They spare us—And why—The Constable—"Hats off"—The High Court—The true Newgate Calender—The Attendance—The Convention invoketh the protection of the Eagle of America—He sheltereth us—He discriminateth—The Foreigner and the Native Americans—The Old Samson and the New—The Printer's Devil on a frolic—Æsthetic calligraphy—Adjournment of Coalition Legislature—What it did and what it left undone—Invitation to the President—A brief programme of his Reception—The Master of Ceremonies—"The Sims Brigade"—The Guard of Honor—The Presence Chamber—The use for the Mayor and Aldermen—Dirty Walking—Review of the Sims Brigade—The Correspondent bewaileth himself—The Uniform and the Horse—General Wool—His modest merit—Objections to his success—The hogs in armor—Colonel Wright and General Cushing—The Rescue Trials—Attorney Lunt—Judge Sprague—Lewis Hayden on trial, &c., &c., &c.*

Boston, June 8th, 1851.

The New England Anti-Slavery Convention which held its Annual Meeting here last week, and of which you have given the Official Proceedings, was one of the most successful of those always successful Anniversaries. The Official Report of such a Meeting, however good, can bear to its living self but the proportion of a skeleton to the breathing, moving, speaking being whose frame-work it expresses. It was instinct with life from the beginning. The speakers were of the best, and in the best condition. The "*fleas* of Conventions," of which we have had so abundant a share in former years, though they were some of them there, yea and of that valiant sort Shakespeare tells off "that dare eat their breakfast on the lip of a lion," were merciful unto us this year. One reason of their abstinence might have been the absence of all the element of riot and disorder which has almost always been ready to sustain and provoke their attacks. We had, indeed, a constable in attendance against the possible emergency of an outbreak of unquestionable lunacy; but the wight had so little to do that he employed himself in making the boys and other denizens of the Gallery take off their hats, for all the world as if we were a Court of Justice. As, indeed, we were—a High Court of Justice for the trial and condemnation of the greatest Crimes and the most gigantically mean criminals that that veritable Newgate Calender pleasantly called History, has to record. But then it was gratifying to find that our official dignity was thus recognized and vindicated.

The attendance was always as large as the places where the meetings were held would contain, and on the last day many were turned away empty from the door. The shelter which I told you we intended to seek in the evenings under the wings of the Eagle of our Country (on the reverse of our national quarter-dollars) was as effectual as we could have desired. That egregious fowl never did better service. The "terror of his beak and the lightning of his eye" drove all evil doers far from us. Cochituate Hall was always as full as it could hold and more than as many tickets more could have been sold, had there been room. The Bird o' Freedom by no means excluded opposers, but only those incorruptible patriots who will only save their country and come to the rescue of the Constitution and the Union, *gratis*. I saw many persons whom I had no reason to suppose favorers of our doctrine or discipline, and I was credibly assured that there were a number of slaveholders present at the sessions generally, and especially in the evenings. Although Mr. Thompson was present and spoke every day and evening, and although his speeches were not of a nature to soothe and gratify the Unregenerate American heart, he was heard with the most entire attention and respect—and this as well at the day sessions, which were open to all, as at the evening ones. Our own Native Americans who took part in the debates, Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, Theodore Parker, Burleigh, the Fosters, Pillsbury and many others, never made better speeches.

By the way, your Senior Corresponding Editor desires me to ask you to correct a slight variation from the text he sent you of his editorial last week, in which your frolic types indulged themselves. Your readers may have been astonished to find at the head of the list of well-known speakers the name of Mr. Samson. This name though well known to them as students of the Old Testament, was perhaps new to them in the relation of an Anti-Slavery orator. Perhaps it would be well to state that it stood originally, for "Mr. *Garrison*;" but possibly the prank of your imp was, after all, not so much amiss. Mr. Garrison certainly does not resemble Samson of old in the particular of being blind, nor yet in that of his strength residing in his *hair*. But he fought the Philistines single-handed once and has routed them over and over again with means of scarcely more apparent efficiency than his prototype of old. I am sure that he will never be found

"Eyeless, in Gaza, in the mill, with slaves,"

but trust that he will carry off its gates yet, and perhaps pull down the temple of our Dagon, not to perish beneath its ruins, but to assist in its re-edification as a shrine of the true God. I think the types must have had method in their madness. That there could have been any mistake arising from the chirography of your assistant is simply impossible, as all will testify who have ever had the æsthetic pleasure of gazing on his calligraphic productions

Our Great and General Court have at last adjourned, after the longest session within the memory of the oldest inhabitant. The election of Mr. Sumner is all that this Coalition Legislature has accomplished. They passed a Plurality law, by means of which the Whigs have got two members of Congress and the Coalitionists nothing, for Mr. Rantoul had a clear majority and would have been chosen under the old law. Mr. Buckingham's Bill and the Anti-Slavery Resolutions were strangled, as was that for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. Two things, besides Mr. Sumner's election, this Legislature did. It voted to build the Sepulchre of Captain Isaac Davis, of Acton, who was the first officer killed in the Revolutionary War, and it unanimously invited the illustrious Fillmore to visit the State. A due proportion of Free Soilers are on the Committees to welcome the Great Kidnapper to the scenes hallowed by the memories of Warren and of Sims, the two martyrs, the one of American Liberty as it was expected to be, and the other of American Liberty as it actually is. Marshal Tukey, as the Saviour of the Country and the City's Slavecatcher in Chief, will act as Master of the Ceremonies. The Boston Brigade, which your Senior Corresponding Editor has been graciously pleased to allow to assume the style and title of "the Sims Brigade," in commemoration of their gallant and meritorious conduct during the late memorable campaign, will be on duty. The Courthouse will again wear its chains as its proper Court-dress for the Reception of the National Nigger-catcher. The apartment consecrated by the presence of Sims to the Genius of American Liberty will be assigned to the Head of the Nation as a Presence Chamber eminently appropriate to the times and the people. The Boston Police and Watchmen will constitute the Guard of Honor, respectively by day and by night. The Common Council will do the honors of the City, as the Mayor and Aldermen have not yet been able to get up out of the mud into which the Great Expounder kicked them some weeks since. They will do very well to walk over, however, though it will be rather dirty walking. I will give you further particulars hereafter.

Talking of "the Sims Brigade," I lost the glorious opportunity of seeing it reviewed by His Excellency the Coalition Governor, "in a new and costly uniform," mounted upon "a small and nervous horse," according to the tantalizing descriptions of the newspapers. It was that confounded New England Convention that came between me and the gratification of my fondest hopes. I endeavored to catch a glimpse of this beatific Vision on the next Monday, being the Feast of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, of which I have given you accounts of yore, in Ancient, if not Honorable, epistles. But somehow or another I missed of it, and was obliged to be content with the sight of General Wool, an humble individual who, it is understood, will consent, upon great entreaty and partly to save our lives, to be made President of these United States. I think that his *name* will be found an insuperable objection. Then he is a Northern man and lacks the one thing needful, to wit, *niggers*. So I fear he will never find himself, as the song hath it,

"In de place where de *Wool* ought to be!"

I must say, however, that he appeared among the hogs in armor of militia officers to the advantage which the Real Thing will always have over the Brummagem Imitation of it. I must except Colonel Wright, who was Captain of the Company, whose campaign in Mexico had given him "a swashing and a martial outside." But truth must compel me to say that I can make no exception of the gallant General Cushing, who came near dying, as a soldier should, in *a ditch* in Mexico, and who succeeds to the command of that venerable but slightly cockneyish Association.

I am quite sure you sympathize with us in our joy at the happy issue of the trial of Scott, as one of the Rescuers of Shadrach. An acquittal was impossible, with the advantages the Government has for packing a jury, in a State Trial. A disagreement was all that we hoped for; and an equal division of the jury was more than the most sanguine had expected. Attorney Lunt, even with the assistance of Mr. Lord (who, some scandalous bystander said, was distinguished from his associate by being a lawyer and a gentleman), was no match for his antagonists, Mr. Hale and Mr. Dana. Judge Sprague, indeed, did his best to supply his deficiencies by acting as leading counsel for the United States, and, being a man of unquestionable ability, and perfectly unscrupulous, and having the last word, he seemed to have the defendant at a deadly advantage. But it seems there were six men to be neither cajoled nor bullied into giving a verdict against their convictions. As Scott's case was undoubtedly the strongest the Government had, it is to be hoped no convictions can be obtained. Lewis Hayden is now on trial. I trust that a verdict of his peers will acquit him of any suspicion of a disloyal act to the country that has treated him and his so uncommonly well.

D. Y.

LETTER FROM DANIEL WAITE.

Copenhagen, Lewis Co., June 6, 1851.

Friend Gay:

We look upon this country as lost to the principles of the gospel and liberty. We are forbidden, by the highest authority of our country, to feed, clothe, shelter, entertain or in any way befriend the poor and oppressed, under heavy penalties. We are by the powers of this government transformed into a national pack of bloodhounds to hunt the poor and oppressed, and reënslave the children of God! The high priests of our nation have baptized the Fugitive Slave Law, in the name of their God, their Christ and his Apostles! and have commanded all the American churches to fall down and worship this image of oppression, set up by the latter Daniel and the slaveholders of this nation.

We ask, Oh Lord! how long shall this nation be ruled by seventy-five thousand slaveholders, by the merchant and the cotton-mill aristocracy of our nation? We think it will be until the professed church eats of the leaves of the Tree of Life, that heals the nations.

Here we have a Beast with a greater number of horns than any we read of. This Beast has been worshipped by all nations, and has received honors from the whole civilized world. It is at present, however, diseased in its northern limbs, and the disease is incurable. Its progress is slow, but certain. Its aim is the death of the Beast; and if it was not for the second Beast, with two horns like a lamb, but speaks like a dragon and gives all his power to the Beast that enslaves and brutalizes this nation, this northern disease would destroy the Beast much sooner.

We are led, then, to this conclusion: the political power, the trade power and the church power of this nation have entered into a holy alliance against the gospel of Christ, and have agreed to destroy Liberty and deify Slavery and Oppression.

We should like to see Frederick Douglass step into the letter of the Constitution and into its oaths to be true to it, as now taught by the highest bench of the nation, and show us its Anti-Slavery life, and power, and character!

But we don't expect to see that in the Constitution that never existed there. The Constitution is only a compromise with sin, binding the whole nation to sin against the oppressed and the poor; although a Goodell, a Smith, a Spooner, and a Douglass may try to find the Anti-Slavery life and power in the Constitution, it is just like looking for the living among the dead.—These gentlemen may do much good, but their number and power is on the wane.

I verily thought once that they would do something, but now I think that they themselves will see yet that their labor is in vain. No political action under the present Constitution can do any good, for every man that takes the oath of office to be true to the constitution and then takes an Anti-Slavery position in the framing of laws perjures himself. So, we that refuse to take any action in the government by our votes will do more by moral suasion than this political party with their new views of the constitution.

Our position, then, is to use moral suasion. We must pour out Anti-Slavery truth into the mass of the people and create a conscientious feeling throughout the North for the enslaved, and so increase this northern plague of Abolition sentiment.

Every true minister of Christ must mix Anti-Slavery truth in every prayer, sermon and fireside conversation; and show by our work of love to the oppressed, crushed, panting slave that we are of the good Samaritan tribe; that we believe in breaking every yoke and in letting the oppressed go free. Let us also do all in our power to do away with the colorphobia that is so prevalent, and influence all of the colored people to rise above the low vices of the age.

In conclusion, I would say let all the Anti-Slavery lecturers put on the whole armor of God, and sound the notes of truth, deep and loud, throughout land.

Daniel Waite.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM OUR DUBLIN CORRESPONDENT.

Dublin, May 16, 1851.

My dear Gay: In my last letter I gave you some account of the proceedings of the recent Yearly Meeting of Friends, in Dublin, in reference to Anti-Slavery matters. But my epistle grew to such a length that I was obliged to postpone some particulars that may interest you and the friends of the cause in America. One of these was the report of a Deputation sent by Friends in England, to present an "Address on Slavery and the Slave Trade" to the sovereigns and heads of governments in many parts of Europe, with a view to obtain their co-operation as fellow laborers in the Anti-Slavery cause. The principal member of this mission is a Corresponding member of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, who, as a minister in good esteem among Friends, travelled for many years in the United States. He was also one of those messengers from the London Yearly Meeting who visited America, some years ago, for the purpose of recommending the Anti-Slavery Friends of Indiana to make an unconditional submission to the Yearly Meeting of that State, from which they had been compelled to secede in consequence of having followed the advice repeatedly given them in the epistles of the London Yearly Meeting, to be faithful to the slave and to unite with those of other persuasions who were laboring in his behalf. It is difficult, at least to me, to imagine any thing more inconsistent than it was to send such messengers with such a message all the way to Indiana, when we recollect that two members of the deputation had been clerks of the London Yearly Meeting for years together, and were, most probably, the draughtsmen of the very epistles in which the advice was given that they themselves now virtually recommended the Anti-Slavery Friends of Indiana to ignore. Observe, this mission from London was not one of sympathy to the faithful friends of the slave in Indiana. No such thing. The Indiana Anti-Slavery Friends had been so much discountenanced by the rest of the Society for their faithfulness to the advice of the London Yearly Meeting that they had no choice but to form a separate organization of their own for the maintenance of their religious privileges, or else to give up their advocacy of the Anti-Slavery cause in the way that they believed effective and right. Like honest men, they chose the better part. They came to the righteous conclusion that the abolition of American Slavery is infinitely more important than the maintenance of any religious organization. And it was virtually to persuade them to alter this resolution—to prefer the integrity of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends to the maintenance of their own convictions of Anti-Slavery duty—and for no other purpose—that the London Yearly Meeting sent their messengers to the back woods of America. Considering the general intelligence of Friends in England, all they have expended and all they have done for the slave, I do not think a more striking instance could be adduced of the power of sectarianism to blind people to the truth and lead them into a course of conduct inconsistent with their own declared opinions. Far removed from American pro-Slavery influence, they could only have acted as they did from an impression that however important Anti-Slavery action may be, it is not to be compared with the apparent interests of their own religious organization. When this is so much the feeling with Friends, who have no paid ministry, nor any class among them, except the very poor, peculiarly interested in the maintenance of the Society, it is not to be wondered at that many of the other sects practically ignore the Anti-Slavery cause and embrace slaveholders and their abettors without scruple, in their anxiety for the enlargement of the borders of their respective Zions.

But I have given you a lengthy preface to my "Short History of a Long Travel." I told you that a member of this same embassy to Indiana is also the principal selected messenger of Friends in England to the Kings and Princes of Europe—who are, as the world knows, for the most part, a set of perjured, blood-stained, unprincipled wretches. Now, I ask you, was it worth an expenditure of thousands of pounds sterling to try and make Abolitionists of such a set of men? And even if the experiment appeared worth making, were they likely to succeed by sending one of their Indiana Mission to read an address to such people? I cannot comprehend this snobbish anxiety, so common in England among Friends as well as others, to rub their skirts against any body with a crown on his head, no matter how black the heart, how bloody the hands, or bankrupt the character of the wearer. To be sure, the Anti-Slavery Mission to the continent obtained access to the Courts of Kings, had audience of them and their ministers, were courteously received, and had an opportunity at the same time of recommending "Friends' principles"—thus attempting two good objects together; and it may be asked what possible objection can there be to the benevolent Society of Friends, who have so long been identified with the efforts for the abolition of the Slave Trade and Slavery, trying to spread information on these subjects among the magnates of Europe, and seeking for their co-operation, even though some of their rulers and their ministers be among the most cruel and perjured villains that ever disgraced humanity—the princes or statesmen, for example, of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Baden, Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and so forth? I answer, because it is "giving the children's meat to the dogs;" it is "throwing pearls before swine." As we do not "gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles," it was a monstrous misapplication of zeal and money to waste them on the very people that are least likely of all others to sympathise or assist in the object in view. Throughout the greater part of Europe travelled by the deputation, public opinion is kept down by the bayonet, and their governments, having little to do with Slave Trade or chattel Slavery, are likely to devote more of that time for the promotion of liberty abroad, which they so badly need for the establishment of political despotism and mental subjugation at home. And further, it is preposterous that *such* a religious body should seek the co-operation of *such* a hopeless set of converts, whilst they are apt to avoid the co-operation of the prominent members of the American Anti-Slavery Society—men and women whose personal characters are unimpeached, whose integrity and devotedness are above suspicion. I know it is objected to some of them that they hold opinions on other matters such as Friends do not like: some of them are Non-resistants—others are not Orthodox—as if the Non-resistant had not as good texts for his interpretation of Scripture as the Quaker, who holds by the armed police while he disclaims the army; as if no Protestant had a right to the exercise of his private judgment unless he were Orthodox and a Quaker. What are the ultramontane Romish universities or the bureaucracies of Europe likely to do for the abolition of Slavery? Are they likely to forward a cause which, in its agitation, stirs up every question of religious, political and intellectual liberty?

Now, I am not afraid that you will understand these remarks as dictated by a hostile disposition towards the Society of Friends. But it is possible that this letter may fall into the hands of others who will differ from your interpretation. I will, therefore, observe that I have merely brought forward the Friends in this connection because I know them well, and respect them as a body, and that all the prepossessions of my youth are in their favor. They, above all other sects, look upon Anti-Slavery effort as a duty, as a testimony given them to bear; and it is well known that throughout the world no man who holds his fellow man in bondage can continue an acknowledged member of their Society, in any of the sections into which it is divided. When this Society, whose members are ex-officio Anti-Slavery, is infected with Pro-Slavery ministers, or at least with ministers who prefer their political parties, the allurements of wealth, and the dread of losing their respectable position by joining in an unpopular agitation, to the cause of Truth and Humanity—when, I say, it is so with them, we cannot wonder that the cause goes lumberingly on, even in England, where all the great sects, when they take part in an earnest advocacy of the Anti-Slavery cause, are obliged to listen to the disheartening facts that hundreds of thousands of their fellow professors including clergy and office bearers, are slaveholders, or the advocates of a do-nothing apologetic conduct towards "the sum of all villainies." I thank the brave old John Wesley, for teaching me that word. When the Episcopalians, Independents, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists, are all in communion and in habits of intercourse with their sinning fellow church members in America, we see what necessity there is for vigilance and zeal on all hands against the contamination of the treacherous, falsifying spirit of American Pro-Slavery. Forewarned is forearmed. It is of exceeding importance that all should know and comprehend the enemy they have to deal with, or they can never be prepared against him.

I need not tell you that I have been extremely delighted and interested with Geo. Thompson's speeches in the United States. They fill my heart with the throbbings that filled them when for the first time, through his instrumentality, I became interested in the Anti-Slavery cause. His readiness, his copiousness, his affluence of language astonish me. He has always advocated the cause of the oppressed, and has ever been the unswerving friend of freedom at home. No one has a better right to lift up his voice for the slave in America. You know how searchingly the acts of public men are liable to be canvassed and unkindly criticized. I never heard any objection made to the consistency or uprightness of a single public act of George Thompson.

You are aware that, for some weeks past, many of our newspapers, and not a few of the religious bodies, have taken up, with great apparent earnestness, the importance of bearing a consistent Anti-Slavery testimony to such of your countrymen as are likely to visit England during the great Exhibition. Among these has at last appeared a very friable article in the British and Foreign *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, in the shape of an Address to the great religious organizations, as well as to the Committees of the Bible, Missionary and Tract Societies, from the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in whose name it is signed by their Secretary, John Scoble. It prays them "to take such steps as shall effectually prevent all parties implicated in the support of Slavery in the United States from access to their pulpits, and to the fellowship of their churches, and by these means show their determination not only to discountenance the system of American Slavery, but *all its abettors* also; whilst at the same time you give a cordial reception to those who act upon opposite principles, as worthy of double honor." This is as it should be, and *as it should have been*. It is deplorable that an Anti-Slavery body which has had such influence, not only in the prestige of its former labor, but in the pecuniary means at its command, should have lessened its own influence so much, by sectarian hollowness, to the great injury of the Anti-Slavery cause, both here and in America. How many unflinching upright friends of the slave have come to England and returned to America, since 1839, not only without the "cordial reception" and the "double honor" to which they were entitled, but with the consciousness that if they had been notoriously indifferent to the slave's cause, they would not have been treated with greater hostility and neglect

I lately met with the Narrative of a Josiah Henson, a fugitive slave, who is now in England, seeking for funds to maintain some Society for the benefit of the colored people in Canada. It was amusing enough, but some of the details were so marvellous that my suspicions were aroused, and a day or two after I was not surprised by meeting, in *The Liberator*, an advertisement, from parties in Canada, warning all whom it might concern not to entrust their money to Josiah Henson. This man gives himself out as having a tolerable gift as an exhorter, and he spoke with such ability in London that he was warmly taken by the hand by a Mr. Binney, an eminent dissenting minister. It is of exceeding importance that such people should be immediately unmasked. They do great injury, for people who have once been deceived by one colored man in this way are liable ever after to include all the rest in the same condemnation. I make it a point when called upon by any such to ask for an introduction from some one in America on whose recommendation I can rely.

Yours ever truly,

Richard D. Webb.

Receipts for the Standard.

FROM MAY 1st TO JUNE 1st.

572	Joseph Pierce, Pleasantville, N. Y.	2 00
587	G. Wells, Holland Patent, N. Y.	2 00
582	B. Rodgers, Randolph, O.	4 00
568	W. T. Codding, Bristol Centre, N. Y.	1 00
728	Benj. Bowne, Salem, O	2 00
572	John C. Merritt, Farmingdale, N. Y.	2 00
553	Robert G. Shaw, Boston, Mass.	50
573	A. Clapp, Weymouth, Mass.	6 00
596	Mary Shadd, N. Y. City,	1 00
572	Henry Bonnell, Seneca Falls, N. Y.	2 00
520	Wm. S. Dell, " "	2 00
572	Levi Laing, " "	2 00
572	R. P. Hunt, " "	2 00
572	Edward Everett, Cambridge, Mass.	2 00
608	S. Howland, Red Creek, N. Y.	1 50
572	Thomas A. Green, New Bedford, Mass.	2 00
584	A. Bushnell, Standfordville, N. Y.	2 00
622	L. B. Fagler, Kinderhook, N. Y.	2 00
584	John Fuller, Kingston, Mass.	2 00
558	A. P. Converse, Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.	2 00
572	John Cutter, Jeffrey, N. H.	5 00
572	Richard Willetts, Babylon, N. Y.	5 00
572	David Wood, Uxbridge, Mass.	5 52
570	G. Baker, South Easton, N. Y.	16
572	Charles B. Taylor, Pittsburgh, Pa.	2 00
599	A. Gilbert, West Brookfield, Mass.	2 00
616	Phebe H. Jones, Troy, N. Y.	2 00
585	Lydia Mott, Albany, N. Y.	2 00
572	Harvy Chase, Vally Falls, R. I.	3 25
597	D. P. Livermore, Stafford, Ct.	1 00
572	Samuel Hall, Boston, Mass.	4 00
573	J. Gardner, "	4 00
572	Charles A. Smith, "	3 75
580	Wm. I. Bowditch, "	2 00
596	Rev. J. M. Spear, "	1 00
572	Sarah Harris, Fall River, Mass.	6 00
598	A. Wilder, Syracuse, N. Y.	1 00
560	H. H. Howland, West Walworth, N. Y.	5 00
624	Rosa Smith, Syracuse, N. Y.	2 00
624	S. S. Hayward, Peterboro', N. Y.	2 00
567	Wm Arnot, Coila, N. Y.	2 00
573	H. D. Ford, Chatham Four Corners, N. Y.	1 50
568	Dr. W. Wilson, Cadiz, O.	2 00
572	D F. Child, Boston, Mass.	2 00
575	Anna W. Cotton, "	2 00
572	Wm P. Atkinson, "	5 62
598	Dr. Josilin, Syracuse, N. Y.	1 00
624	A. C Mncy, Hudson, N. Y.	2 00
572	R. Donaldson, Standfordville, N. Y.	2 50
572	E. Quincy, Dedham, Mass.	2 00
572	Mrs. E. A Rodgers, Bellerica, Mass.	2 00
572	Josiah Quincy, Boston, Mass.	4 00
588	Vesta Bicknell, Medina, O.	2 00
624	E. Conger, Newark, N. J.	2 00
611	Rowland Johnson, New York City,	2 00
572	Mrs. Daniel Trimble " " "	3 16
572	Wm. Dall, Boston, Mass.	2 00
617	C. Bramhall, " "	3 00
625	Laura Flint, Leicester, Mass.	2 00
572	O. Davis, Quaker Springs, N. Y.	4 16
572	Daniel H. Abbott, Hingham, Mass.	6 68
572	W. A. Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y.	4 00
598	Otis R. Potter, New York City,	1 00
579	Temple Fay, " " "	2 00
638	Mrs. Marshall, " " "	2 00
598	R. Holland, " " "	2 00
624	John Benton, New Concord, O.	2 00
624	Moses Pierce, Pleasantville, N. Y.	2 00
624	John Ketchum, Jericho, N. Y.	2 00
572	Rufus Reynolds, Purchase, N. Y.	2 00
572	R. C. Warren, N. Y. City,	1 25
576	John Woodgate, " "	2 00
622	David Ketchum, Pleasant Valley, N. Y.	2 00
570	A. Green, Port Byron, N. Y.	4 25
572	M. M. Davis, Bemis Heights, N. Y.	1 00
572	Seth Rigby, Pennville, Ind.	3 70
		$189 23

DONATIONS.

Elizabeth Pease, Darlington, England, (by W. L. Garrison,)	98 00
Sarah B. Shaw, Massachusetts,	25 00
E Conger, Newark, N. J.	1 00

DONATIONS COLLECTED BY A. K. FOSTER.

Carlinthy Gould, West Walworth, N. Y.	3 00
Joseph Gould, " " "	2 10
Henry A. Howland, " " "	1 05
Daniel Gould, " " "	1 00
Amos Gould, " " "	1 00
Geo. E. Underhill, " " "	66
O. Gould, " " "	65
Phebe J. Howland, " " "	60
E. R. Clum, " " "	50
Mary Hicks, " " "	25
Maria Fisher, " " "	25
Laura Burbanks, " " "	25
A Friend, " " "	1 00
Collection, " " "	2 43
	$138 74
	189 23
Total,	$327 97

——Elisha Bartlett, M. D., is elected successor to the late Dr. J. B. Beck, in the chair of Materia Medica, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York.

——We don't like to strike a man when he is down, but we may be permitted to express our satisfaction at the defeat of Mr. Henry B. Stanton in the XXVth Senate District. This gentleman was originally a zealous Abolitionist; then he became a Liberty Party man, and in that capacity did his best in 1844 to give the vote of this State to Mr. Polk and secure the annexation of Texas; after that he was a Free Soiler on the Buffalo platform, from which he has sunk by easy and apparently natural degrees into a filthy and disgusting kind of Hunkerism. In 1850, in his place in the Senate, he voted against Free Soil Resolutions, and in 1851 he was prominent in the conspiracy to defeat the Canal bill. If all these facts do not indicate a demagogue of a very mean and pitiful sort we have no skill in political diagnosis. At any rate the people of the district think so, for after an industrious canvass by himself and friends he has been defeated by some hundred votes In 1849 he had 669 majority in this very district. The change is due to the disgust felt at his general course as well as at his share in the late disorganization of the Senate.—*Tribune.*

——The seventeen year locusts have appeared in large numbers in various parts of the country. Newspapers report their presence in most parts of the middle and northwestern States.

——Emancipation of Slaves.—A provision has been adopted by the Virginia Reform Convention, in Committee of the Whole, prohibiting the Legislature of the State from passing any law for the emancipation of slaves.

——The oldest person returned by the census takers in the United States is Sukey Wright, a colored woman, in the city of Baltimore. She is 120 years of age, and the Assistant Marshal says there is no doubt of the fact. At the time of the Revolution in 1775, she had a child 25 years of age.

——Whipping a Slave to Death.—Simeon Souther, a wealthy citizen of Hanover Co., Virginia, has been convicted of beating one of his own slaves to death, and sentenced to the penitentiary for five years.—*Watertown (N. Y.) Reformer.*

——American Slavery Abroad.—Fifty-one ministers, educated at the colleges at Stepney, near London, Bristol, and Bradford, met at the Guildhall Coffeehouse last week, and united in "expressing their abhorrence of the Fugitive Slave Law, as opposed to every principle of humanity and religion." Non-intercourse with American ministers of the Gospel who supported the law, was resolved upon.—*For. Cor. N. Y. Independent.*

MARRIAGES.

Hallock—Hull.—On May 29, by Friends ceremony, at the house of Wm. E. Rose, in this City, Isaac S. Hallock with Phebe Hull, both of Milton.

Edwards—Tappan.—At Belleville, N. J., May 29, by Rev. James C. Richmond, Wm. H. Edwards, of this City, to Katharine, youngest daughter of Arthur Tappan, Esq.

Fisk—Bininger.—In this city, 5th inst, Samuel A. Fisk, M.D. of Northampton, Mass, to Harriet B, daughter of the late Jacob Bininger of N. Y.

Parsons—Leggett.—On the 4th inst., at Flushing, L. I., by Friends ceremony, William B. Parsons to Mary F., daughter of Thos. Leggett, Jr., both of the above place.

Bartlett—Willard.—In Cambridge, 4th inst., Mr. John Bartlett, Bookseller to the University, to Miss Hannah S., daughter of Hon. Sidney Willard.

DEATHS.

Rich.—In Boston June 3, Benjamin Rich, Esq, 75 years.

Wells.—In Boston June 3, Titus Welles, Esq, 75

Thurston.—At Flushing, Long Island, on Wednesday morning, May 28, Abigail E., wife of Wm. R. Thurston, in the 67th year of her age.

Hinsdale.—In Troy, N. Y. 16th inst. Nancy Hinsdale, 82, the venerable senior Vice President of the Troy Female Seminary, formerly of Pittsfield, Mass.

Baldwin.—In New Haven, Judge Simeon Baldwin, father of Hon. Roger S. Baldwin, late United States Senator from Connecticut, 90.

Mathews.—On the 28th inst, near Willow Grove, Pa., Caleb Bently Mathews, Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in the Homœpathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, in the 52nd year of his age.

Culver.—Suddenly, at Louisville, Ky., on May 19, Mrs. Adelia Culver, consort of Dr. F B. Culver, and second daughter of Hon. Amos Kendall.

Preble.—At Portland, Maine, on the 28th ult., Mrs. Preble, widow of Com. Edw. Preble aged 81.

Childs.—In this City On Sunday morning June 1st., Colonel Heman W. Childs, aged 63 years.

Barker.—In Philadelphia on the 6th inst., of scarlet fever, Abraham, youngest son of Abraham and Sarah W. Barker, aged 20 months.

Paine.—At Haverhill, Mass., on Saturday morning, May 31st, Sarah Paine, aged 83 years, relict of the Hon. Elijah Paine, of Williamstown, Vermont.

Bright.—At Indianapolis, Ia., 26th ult., David G. Bright, Esq, father of Hon. Jesse D. Bright, U. S. Senator, aged 77 years.

Innis.—At Cedar Hill, near Frankfort, Ky., 12th ult., Mrs. Anna, relict of the Hon. Henry Innis, and mother of Mrs. J. J Crittenden

FAREWELL SOIREE TO GEO. THOMPSON, M. P.

☞ In accordance with a vote unanimously adopted at the late New England Convention, the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society hereby announce a FAREWELL SOIREE and supper to be given to that distinguished advocate of Universal Freedom, GEORGE THOMPSOM, of England.

The Soiree will take place at Assembly Hall, Albany street (over the Boston and Worcester Railroad Depot), on Monday evening, June 16th.

TICKETS, 50 cents each, will be for sale at the book-store of J. P. Jewett, 19 Cornhill, and by R. F. Wallcut, 21 Cornhill.

☞ Immediate application for tickets should be made, that sufficient accommodations may be provided.

By order of the Board,

SAMUEL MAY, Jr.,
JOSEPH K. HAYES,
JAMES B. RICHARDS,
JOSHUA B. SMITH,
AUSTIN BEARSE,
} Committee of Arrangements

THE BRITISH PERIODICALS
AND THE
FARMER'S GUIDE.

Liberal Offers to New Subscribers!

LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,
No. 54 Gold Street, New York,

CONTINUE to publish the four leading British Quarterly Reviews and Blackwood's Magazine; in addition to which they have recently commenced the publication of a valuable Agricultural work, called the

"Farmer's Guide to Scientific and Practical Agriculture."

By Henry Stephens, F.R.S., of Edinburg, author of the "*Book of the Farm*," &c. &c.; assisted by John P. Norton, M. A., New Haven, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College, &c., &c.

This highly valuable work will comprise two large royal octavo volumes, containing over 1400 pages, with 18 or 20 splendid steel engravings, and more than 600 engravings on wood, in the highest style of the art, illustrating almost every implement of husbandry now in use by the best farmers, the best methods of ploughing, planting, haying, harvesting, &c. &c., the various domestic animals in their highest perfection; in short, the *pictorial* feature of the book is unique, and will render it of incalculable value to the student of agriculture.

The work is being published in Semi-monthly Numbers, of 64 pages each, exclusive of the Steel engravings, and, when not taken in connection with the Reviews or Blackwood, is sold at 25 Cents each, or $5 for the entire work in numbers, of which there will be at least twenty-two:

The British Periodicals Re-published are as follows, viz.:
THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW (Conserv'e),
THE EDINGBURG REVIEW (Whig),
THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW (Free-Church),
THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW (Liberal), and
BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE (Tory)

TERMS AND PREMIUMS.

[See list of Premium Volumes below.]

				Per ann.
For any 1 of the four Reviews and	1	Prem.	vol.	$3.00
For any 2 do	" 1	"	"	5.00
For any 3 do	" 2	"	"	7.00
For all four of the Reviews,	" 2	"	"	8.00
For Blackwood's Magazine,	" 1	"	"	3.00
For Blackwood and 3 Reviews,	" 3	"	"	9.00
For Blackwood and 4 Reviews,	" 3	"	"	10.00
For Farmer's Guide (22 Nos.)	" 1	"	"	5.00
" do 1 Rev'w or Black.	" 1	"	"	7.00
" do any 2 Reprints	" 2	"	"	9.00
" do " 3 "	" 2	"	"	11.00
" do " 4 "	" 3	"	"	13.00
" do and all 5 "	" 3	"	"	14.09

(Payments to be made in all cases in Advance.)

[PREMIUM VOLUMES.]

Foreign Quarterly Review (comprising 1 year).
Blackwood's Magazine (6 months).
London Quarterly Review (1 year).
Bentley's Miscellany (6 months).
Edinburgh Review (1 year).
Metropolitan Magazine (6 months).
Westminster Review (1 year).

☞ Remittances and communications should be always addressed, post-paid or franked, to the Publishers.

LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,
79 Fulton Street, New York,
Entrance 54 Gold St

d12

Miscellany.

HORACE WALPOLE.

[From a review in the London *Examiner* of "The Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Oxford, with the Rev William Mason," just published in London, by Bentley, under the editorial supervision of Rev. J. Mitford.]

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF HORACE WALPOLE, EARL OF OXFORD, AND THE REV. WILLIAM MASON. Now first published from the original MS. Edited, with notes, by the Rev. J. Mitford. Two vols. Bentley.

We find ourselves quite as happy to sit at our ease and read eternal new letters by Horace Walpole, as ever Gray was to "lie on a sofa all day long" and read eternal new romances by Marivaux and Crebillon. With Gray himself and Madame de Sévigné, to his love and admiration for both of whom the volumes before us bear ample testimony, Horace Walpole divided the "crown and palm" of this department of literature. And if he did not always exhibit the ease and unaffected charm which the others possessed, he yet cultivated and practised the art so much more upon system, as to have left in his letters a really important contribution to the history of his time. Nowhere do we find the political or social characteristics of his age more clearly reflected, and to no quarter may we look for a more vivid expression of the general history of the sixty years during which his long life enabled him to mix with public men.

The inconsistencies of his own character, which, more than any intention to mislead, occasionally impair the fidelity of his portraits, need not here be dwelt upon. He was justly proud of his literary talents, and foolishly ashamed to be thought so. He was a gentleman born, and impatient to be counted a man of letters, he was a politician *manque*, and anxious to be reckoned a philosopher; and, being a philosopher and a gentleman, he would have had the world believe in no literature and in no politics excepting those which he condescended himself to trifle with. He helps the king and the ministers, though he finds it of no use; he saves the country, though he protests it was not worth saving; and he writes books for idle people, though he warns idle people not to think of reading them. And so contradictions meet us continually; but we persist in spite of them We can see, through all, that Walpole was really much more amiable and estimable than he cared to be thought. We smile to compare his elaborate professions of indifference to every body with his painstaking efforts to please every body. And whenever these more amiable and sincere qualities get the better of his habits of foppery and insincerity, we find nowhere such pungent wit, such charming sense, such exquisite and happy discernment, as in the letters of Horace Walpole. Nor, though these favorable points of character are really abundent with him have we even to depend upon them for the interest and amusement he offers us. As we have heretofore remarked, he makes readible whatever he touches, and in whatever vein. We despise the trifles he exalts we resent the injustice he commits, we laugh at his conceited pretensions, but we read on. We cannot help it.

When we noticed the last published series of letters by Walpole, now nearly four years ago, we mentioned the existence of the present series of letters to Gray's friend and biographer Mason. We believe them to be really the *last*. Setting aside some half dozen letters belonging to as many earlier years, and two or three at the very close of Walpole's life (for politics had made an intervening gap of some twelve years' duration in their intimacy), the continuous correspondence may be said to extend from 1771 to 1784; or, from the shady side of Walpole's fiftieth, to the sunny side of his seventieth year; and we see the steady and regular advances of age and gout plaguing poor Horace not a little. Discontent sours the philosophy, and gout embitters the gossip now and then, while prejudices of the most ridiculous kind make the criticism next to worthless. But still the old charm survives, and predominates over all.

The subjects touched upon in the correspondence with Mason are less common, belonging less to the general field of politics and society; and the letters themselves have therefore fewer repetitions of what we have read in Walpole's former correspondences. On the other hand, this may seem to render them occasionally less entertaining to the general reader, not especially interested in the narrower field they occupy They tell us much concerning Gray, and Walpole's difference with him in early life, though we still doubt if the whole secret of the quarrel be even yet fully revealed. They relate the secret history of the heroic Epistle, which, though now perhaps hardly worth relating, is yet not without curious points of interest for those who like to put themselves behind the scenes with the wits and men of fashion of that day. They bring out with marked prominence Walpole's abhorence of the Scotch, his bitter dislike of Johnson and the men of genius connected with him, his uneasy contempt for Lord Chesterfield and Lord Lyttleton, his impatience of Garrick's popularity, and his better founded scorn of Cumberland and his clique. We do not mention his studied injustice to Chatterton, because in this there was not a little natural resentment of as great an injustice to himself on the part of poor Chatterton's upholders; but perhaps nothing is more painfully impressed on all the letters, than his monstrous persistence in the refusal of all merit to the most distinguished writers of his time who did not happen to belong to his set.

Let the reader remember that within a few years before these letters, and during their continuance, all the writings of Sterne had been produced, and all the writings of Goldsmith; that Johnson had published *Rasselas* and the *Idler*, the edition of *Shakspeare*, the *Dictionary*, and the *Lives of the Poets*; that Smollet had given *Sir Lancelot Greaves* and *Humphrey Clinker* to the world; that the first publication of Lady Mary Wortley Montague's letters had taken place; that Percy had published his *Reliques*, Reid his *Inquiry*, and Hume his immortal *History*; that the most important portion of the *Decline and Fall* had come forth: and that the theatres could boast of the farces of Foote and the comedies of Goldsmith, Colman and Sheridan. Yet here is all that Walpole can say of it!

WHAT WALPOLE THOUGHT OF THE LITERATURE OF HIS DAY.

"What a figure will this our Augustan age make Garrick's prologues, epilogues and verses, Sir. W. Chamber's gardening, Dr. Nowel's sermon, Whittington and his Cat, Sir John Dalrymple's history and the life of Henry II. What a library of poetry taste, good sense, veracity, and vivacity! ungrateful Shebbear! indolent Smollet! trifling Johnson! piddling Goldsmith! how little have they contributed to the glory of a period in which all arts, all sciences are encouraged and rewarded. Guthrie buried his mighty genius in a Review, and Mallet died of his first effusion of his loyalty. The retrospect makes melancholly, but Ossian has appeared, and were Paradise once more lost we should not want an Epic Poem."

We take other passages from the letters exhibiting the same spirit—now simply entertaining!

WALPOLE'S ESTIMATE OF "SHE STOOPS TO CONQUER."

"Dr. Goldsmith has written a comedy—no, it is the lowest of all farces—it is not the subject I condemn, though very vulgar, but the execution. The drift tends to no moral, no edification of any kind—the situations, however, are well imagined, and make one laugh in spite of the grossness of the dialogue, the forced witticisms, and total improbability of the whole plan and conduct. But what disgusts me most, is that though the characters are very low, and aim at low humor, not one of them says a sentence that is natural or marks any character at all. It is set up in opposition to sentimental comedy, and is as bad as the worst of them. Garrick would not act it, but bought himself off by a poor prologue."

LONDON IN 1774.

"I know nothing, but that politics are dead, literature obsolete, the stage lower than in the days of Mysteries, the actors as bad as the plays, the maccaronis as poor as the nabobs are rich, and nothing new upon earth, but coats and waistcoats; as for women, they think almost as little of their petticoats as the men do. We are to have my Lord Chesterfield's works, and my Lord Lyttleton's works, which will not much reanimate the age, the *Saturnia regna*."

GOLDSMITH'S DEATH.

"The republic of Parnassus has lost a member; Dr. Goldsmith is dead of a purple fever, and I think might have been saved, if he had continued James's powder, which had much effect, but his physician interposed. His numerous friends neglected him shamefully at last, as if they had no business with him when it was too serious to laugh. He had lately written epitaphs for them all, some of which hurt, and perhaps made them not sorry that his own was the first necessary. The poor soul had sometimes parts, though never common sense."

ENVY OF SHAKSPEARE.

"Voltaire has lately written a letter against Shakspeare (occasioned by the new paltry translation, which still has discovered his miraculous powers), and it is downright Billingsgate as an apple-woman would utter if you overturned her wheelbarrow, poor old wretch! how envy disgraces the brightest talents! how Gray adored Shakspeare! Partridge, the almanack maker, perhaps was jealous of Sir Isaac Newton. Dr. Goldsmith told me he himself envied Shakspeare, but Goldsmith was an idiot, with once or twice a fit of parts. It hurts one when a real genius like Voltaire can feel more spite than admiration, though I am persuaded that his rancor is grounded on his conscious inferiority. I wish you would lash this old scorpion a little, and teach him awe of English poets."

WALPOLE CRITICISES SHERIDAN.

"I have read Sheridan's Critic, but not having seen it, for they say it is admirably acted, it appeared wondrously flat and old, and a poor imitation; it makes me fear I shall not be so much charmed with the School for Scandal, on reading, as I was when I saw it. Apropos to the theatre, I have read the School for Scandal; it is rapid and lively, but is far from containing the wit I expected from seeing it acted."

ON DAVIE'S LIFE OF GARRICK.

"There is come out a Life of Garrick, in two volumes, by Davies the bookseller, formerly a player. It is written naturally, simply, without pretensions, nay and without partiality, (though under the auspices of Dr. Johnson) unless, as it seems, the prompter reserved all the flattery to himself, and according to an epigram on the late Queen and the Hermitage:

——whispered let the incense all be mine.

"In consequence the author calls the pedant the greatest man of the age, and compares his trumpery tragedy of Irene to Cato. However, the work is entertaining, and deserves immortality for preserving that *sublime* saying of Quin (which, by the way, he profanes by calling it a *bon mot*) who disputing on the execution of Charles I, and being asked by his antagonist by what law he was put to death, replied, *by all the laws he had left them.* I wish you would translate it into Greek, and write it in your Longinus; it has ten times more grandeur, force and meaning, than anything he cites."

WALPOLE'S OPINION OF THE SCOTCH LITERATI.

"Pray look into the Critical Review but one, there you will find that David Hume in a saucy blockheadly note calls Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Bishop Hoadley, *despicable writers*. I believe that ere long the Scotch will call the English *lousy*; and that Goody Hunter will broach the assertion in an anatomic lecture. Not content with debasing and disgracing us as a nation by loosing America, destroying our Empire, and making us the scorn and prey of Europe, the Scotch would annihilate our patriots, martyrs, heroes, and geniuses. Algernon Sidney, Lord Russel, King William, the Duke of Marlborough, Locke, are to be traduced and levelled, and with the aid of their fellow laborer Johnson, who spits at them while he tugs at the same oar, Milton, Addison, Prior, and Gray, are to make way for the dull forgeries of Ossian, and such wits as Davy, and Johnny Hume, Lord Kaims, Lord Monboddo, and Adam Smith!—Oh! if you have a drop of English ink in your veins, rouse and revenge your country! Do not let us be run down and brazened out of all our virtue, genius, sense, and taste, by Laplanders and Bœotians, who never produced one original writer in verse or prose."

On the other hand he affects to spare himself as little:

WALPOLE'S ESTIMATE OF HIMSELF IN 1774.

"I will not quarrel with you about what you say of my wit. Whether I have it, or have had it, I neither know nor care. It was none of my doing; and even if I had it, I am guilty of never having improved it, and of putting it to very trifling uses. Whatever it was, it has gone with my spirits, or passed off with my youth—which I hear the loss of too with patience, though a better possession. But I am seriously hurt with those two words at the conclusion of your letter, *perfect respect*. Jesus! my dear sir, to me, and from you *perfect respect?* on what grounds, on what title?—what is there in me respectable? To have flung away so many advantages in so foolish a manner as I have done, is that respectable? to have done nothing in my life that is praiseworthy, not to have done as much good as I might; does this deserve respect from so good a man as you are? have I turned even my ruling passion, that preservative I call it, pride to account? no—yet hear my sincere confession; I had rather be unknown, and have the pride of virtue, than be Shakspeare, which is all I can say of mortal wit. Nay, I would rather accept that pride of virtue preferably to all earthly blessings, for its own comfortable insolence, though I were sure to be annihilated the moment I die: so far am I from thinking with the saint, that suffering virtue without a future reward, would of all conditions be the most miserable. There are none, or few real evils, but pain and guilt. The dignity of virtue makes everything else a trifle, or very tolerable. Penury itself may flatter one, for it may be inflicted on a man for his virtue, by that paltry thing ermine and velvet a king. Pray, therefore, never respect me any more till my virtues have made me a beggar. I am not melancholy, nor going to write *divine poems*. I have a more manly resolution, which is to mend myself as much as I can, and not let my age be as absurd as my youth. I want to respect myself, the person in the world whose approbation I desire most. The next title I aspire to, but not till that person is content with me, is that of being your sincere friend."

WALPOLE'S OPINION OF HIMSELF IN 1780.

"But it is solemnly true that I have so mean an opinion of myself that I know not how to consent to any honor. Genius I absolutely have not—taste if you please—for of that I should be no more vain than of personal beauty—but I have so much littleness in my mind, such a want of virtue that any praise to my understanding makes me cast my eyes inwards with contrition and disgust. Would not an idol of mud blush if it could, at seeing itself crowned with laurel!—having made my confession to you, my confessor, do what you please, but save me from compliments, and from *Honorables*—there I am proud not humble. I am thoroughly convinced that the wretched ray of an Earldom procured me half my little fame. Things I have published without my name, though not worse than their baptized brethren, have perished in their merited obscurity. I can smile at it, but at least it makes me set no value on my literary reputation."

AN AUTHOR AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

"Authors are said to labor for posterity; for my part I find I did not write even for the rising generation. Experience tells me it was all for those of my own, or near my own, time. The friends I have lost were, I find, more than half the public to me. It is as difficult to write for young people, as to talk to them; I never, I perceive, meant anything about them in what I have written, and cannot commence an acquaintance with them in print."

SELLING ONE'S WRITINGS BETTER THAN SELLING ONE'S SELF.

"I am neither ashamed of being an author or a bookseller. My mother's father was a timber-merchant. I have many reasons for thinking myself a worse man, and none for thinking myself better; consequently I shall never blush at doing anything he did. I print much better than I write, and love my trade, and hope I am not one of those *most undeserving of all objects*, printers and booksellers, whom, I confese, you lash with justice. In short, sir, I have no notion of poor Mr. Gray's delicacy; I would not sell my talents as orators and senators do, but I would keep a shop, and sell any of my own works that would gain me a livelihood, whether books or shoes, rather than be tempted to sell myself. 'Tis an honest vocation to be a scavenger—but I would not be Solicitor General."

There is no affectation in that last assertion—Walpole really felt it. Let us also quote what he says of himself apropos of his quarrel with Gray, in which, even allowing for much that may be still suppressed, we see also much of his real manliness and worth.

WALPOLE'S ACCOUNT OF HIS DIFFERENCE WITH GRAY.

"I am conscious that in the beginning of the difference between Gray and me, the fault was mine. I was too young, too fond of my own diversions, nay, I do not doubt too much intoxicated by indulgence, vanity, and the insolence of my situation, as a Prime Minister's son, not to have been inattentive and insensible to the feelings of one I thought below me; of one, I blush to say it, that I knew was obliged to me; of one whom presumption and folly perhaps made me deem not my superior *then* in parts, though I have since felt my infinite inferiority to him.

"I treated him insolently; he loved me and I did not think he did. I reproached him with the difference between us, when he acted from conviction of knowing he was my superior; I often disregarded his wishes of seeing places, which I would not quit other amusements to visit, though I offered to send him to them without me. Forgive me, if I say that his temper was not conciliating. At the same time that I will confess to you that he acted a more friendly part had I had the sense to take advantage of it; he freely told me of my faults. I declared I did not desire to hear them, nor would correct them. You will not wonder that with the dignity of his spirit, and the obstinate carelessness of mine, the breach must have grown wider till we became incompatible."

"Here is an anecdote and a comment, both highly characteristic:

GIBBON AND HIS CRITIC.

"You will be diverted to hear that Mr. Gibbon has quarrelled with me. He lent me his second volume in the middle of November. I returned it with a most civil panegyric. He came for more incense, I gave it, but alas! with too much sincerity. I added, "Mr. Gibbon, I am sorry *you* should have pitched on so disgusting a subject as the Constantinopolitan History. There is so much of the Arians and Eunomians, and semi-Pelagians; and there is such a strange contrast between Roman and Gothic manners, and so little harmony between a Consul Sabinus and a Ricimer, Duke of the palace, that though you have written the story as well as it could be written, I fear few will have patience to read it." He colored; all his round features squeezed themselves into sharp angles; he screwed up his button-mouth and rapping his snuff-box, said, "it had never been put together before"—so *well* he meant to add—but gulped it. He meant *so well* certainly, for Tillemont, whom he quotes in every page, has done the very thing.—Well, from that hour to this I have never seen him, though he used to call once or twice a week; nor has sent me the third volume as he promised. I well knew his vanity, even about his ridiculous face and person, but thought he had too much sense to avow it so palpably. The history is admirably written, especially in the characters of Julian and Athanasius, in both which he has piqued himself on impartiality—but the style is far less sedulously enamelled than the first volume, and there is flattery to the Scots that would choke anything but Scots, who can gobble feathers as readily as thistles. David Hume and Adam Smith are *legislators* and sages, but the homage is intended for his patron, Lord Loughborough—so much for literature and its fops!"

There is of course no denying that this continual attempt to make "small beer" of the Gibbons, Humes, Goldsmiths, Johnsons, Smollets, and other spirits already secure and serene among the immortals, however amusing in itself, becomes mighty ridiculous by the side of as perpetual and to all appearance most exhilarating draughts of the mild milk-and-water of Mr. Mason. Indeed nothing in the correspondence has amused us more than the unwearied interchange of flattery between the correspondents. One might suppose that the disembodied genius of Shakspeare himself were constantly hovering around *Elfrida* at Strawberry Hill and the *Mysterious Mother* at Aston Rectory.

A THEATRICAL EXAMINER BY WALPOLE.

"I have been to see Elfrida; don't think it was out of revenge, though it is wretchedly acted, and worse set to music. The virgins were so inarticulate, that I should have understood them as well if they had sung choruses of Sophocles. Orgar had a broad Irish accent; I thought the first virgin, who is a lusty virage, called Miss Miller, would have knocked him down, and I hoped she would. Edgar stared at his own crown, and seemed to fear it would tumble off. For Miss Catley, she looked so impudent and was so big with child, you would have imagined she had been singing the black joke, only that she would then have been more intelligible. Smith did not play Athelwold ill; Mrs. Hartley is made for the part, if beauty and figure could suffice for what you write, but she has no one symptom of genius. Still it was very affecting, and does admirably for the stage, under all these disadvantages. The tears came into my eyes, and streamed down the Duchess of Richmond's lovely cheeks."

To this we must subject a most amusing description by Walpole of—

A TRAGEDY AS GOOD AS SHAKSPEARE.

"The Bishop-Count of Bristol, whom I met t'other night at Mrs. Delany's, desired to send me a play, that he confessed he thought equal to the noblest flights of Shakespeare. Such an honor was not to be refused. Arrived the thickest of quartos, full as the egg of an ostrich, with great difficulty I got through it in two days. It is on the story of Lord Russell. John Lilburne himself could not have more whig zeal. The style, extremely deficient in grammer, is flogged up to more extravagant rants than Statius's or Claudian's, with a due proportion of tumbles into the kennel. The devils and damnation supply every curse with brimstone, and hell's sublime is coupled with Newgate, St. James's and Stock's market; every scene is detached, and each as long as an act; and every one might be omitted without interrupting the action, for plot or conduct there is none. Jeffries and Father Petre open the drama, and scourge one another up to the blackest pitch of iniquity. They are relieved by Algernon Sidney and Lord Howard; the first rants like a madman and damns the other to the pit of hell. Lady Russell is not a whit less termagant. The good Earl of Bedford on the contrary is as patient as Job, and forgets the danger of his son to listen to the pathetic narrative of his old steward, whose wife had been Lord Russell's nurse, and died at seeing him sent to the Tower. The second act begins and never ends with Lord Bedford's visit to Newgate, where he gives money to the jailor for leave to see his son. The jailor chouses him, calls himself Emperor of Newgate, and promises to support his tyranny by every act of royal tyranny; compares himself to Salmoneus, and talks of Nabobs, Stock's alley, and Whitfield. Lord Russell comes to the grate, gives more money equally in vain. At last the monarch-jailor demands £1000, Russell promises it; the jailor tenders a promissory note. Lord Russell takes it to sign and finds it stipulates £7,000, and so on, King Charles and the Duke of York enter, quarrel about religion, but agree on cutting Lord Essex's throat, with many such pathetic amenities. The last act contains the whole trial *verbatim*, with the pleadings of the Attorney and Solicitor Generals; Tillotson and Burnet are called to the prisoner's character—in vain—he is condemned. Lord Bedford falls at the King's feet begging his son's life, the King tells him he teazes him to death, and that he had rather be still in Scotland listening to nine hour's sermons delivered:

——Through the funnel
Of noses lengthened down into proboscis.

"This is the only flower I could retain of so dainty a garland; the piece concludes with Lady Russell's swooning on hearing the two strokes of the axe. Now you are a little acquainted with our second Shakspeare! Be assured that I have neither exaggerated in the character given, nor in the account of this tedious but very diverting tragedy."

The writer was a poor Irish parson named Stratford, whom Cumberland had taken it into his head to patronize, and who had less wit than learning, and more simplicity than either learning or wit.

What further extracts we give will amuse the reader, and in all probability send him, in search of more amusement, to the volumes themselves. He will not be disappointed. Walpole's letters throughout are worthy of him; and though Mason's are not so good as we expected, they are a clever foil to Walpole even in their occasional unconscious imitations of him, and now and then they possess considerable interest in themselves. We must not omit to say that the book has been printed in a very slovenly way. Omitted words, and mis-pointed sentences, often render the letters unintelligible. We hardly suppose them to have enjoyed the advantage of revision from Mr. Mitford—to whose well-known taste and knowledge, we should add, we are wholly indebted for the discovery (in the library of Mason's old rectory at Aston) of this new series of the letters of Walpole.

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS.

"About ten days ago I wanted a housemaid, and one presented herself very well recommended; I said, "but, young woman, why do you leave your present place?" She said she could not support the hours she kept, that her lady never went to bed till three or four in the morning. "Bless me, child, said I, why you tell me you live with a Bishop's wife; I never heard that Mrs. North gamed or raked so late." "No, Sir, said she, "but she is three hours undressing." Upon my word, the edifice that takes three hours to demolish, must at least be double the time in fabricating! Would you not for once sit up till morning to see the destruction of the Pyramid and distribution of the materials? Do not mention this, for I did not take the girl, and she still assists at the daily and nightly revolutions of Babel.

"On Tuesday I supped, after the opera, at Mrs. Meynel's with a set of the most fashionable company which, take notice, I very seldom do now, as I certainly am not of the age to mix often with the young people, Lady Melbourne was standing before the fire, and adjusting her feathers in the glass; says she, "Lord! they say the stocks will blow up; that will be very comical."

BARBARISM AND CIVILIZATION.

"When that philosophical tyrant Czarina (who murdered two emperors for the good of the people, to the edification of Voltaire, Diderot and Dalembert) proposed to give a code of laws that should serve all her subjects as much, or as little as she pleased, she ordered her various states to send deputies who should specify their respective wants. Amongst the rest came a representative of the Samoieds; he waited on the marshal of the diet of legislation, who was Archbishop of Novogrod. I am come said the savage, but I do not know for what. My clement mistress, said his grace, means to give a body of laws to all her dominions. Whatever laws the empress shall give us, said Simoied, we shall obey, but we want no laws. How, said the prelate not want laws! why you are men like the rest of the world, and must have the same passions, and consequently must murder cheat, steal, rob, plunder, &c., &c., &c.

"It is true, said the savage, we have now and then a bad person among us, but he is sufficiently punished by being shut out of all society. One day Count Orlow, the Czarina's accomplice in more ways than one, exhibited himself to the Samoied in the robes of the order, and refulgent with diamonds. The savage surveyed him attentively, but silently. May I ask, said the favorite, what is it you admire? No thing, replied the Tartar, I was thinking how ridiculous you are. Ridiculous, cried Orlow angrily; and pray in what? Why you shave your beard to look young, and powder your hair to look old."

FALSE SYMPATHY.

"Those gentry, the Methodists, will grow very troublesome, or worse; they were exceedingly unwilling to part with that impudent hypocrite Dr. Dodd, and not less to have forgery criminal. I own I felt very much for the poor wretch's protracted sufferings—but what was not the motive of their countenances; I cannot bear a militant arch inquisitor or an impostor in a tabernacle."

WALPOLE CRITICIZES THE FIRST AND SECOND ACADEMY EXHIBITIONS AT SOMERSET HOUSE.

"You know, I suppose, that the Royal Academy at Somerset House is opened. It is quite a Roman palace, and finished in perfect taste, as well as boundless expense. It would have been a glorious apparition at the conclusion of the great war; now it is an an insult on our poverty and degradation.—There is a sign post by West of his Majesty holding the memorial of his late campaign, lest we should forget that he was at Coxheath when the French fleet was in Plymouth Sound. By what lethargy of loyalty it happened I do not know, but *there* is also a picture of Mrs. Wright modelling the head of Charles the First, and their Majesties contemplating it. Gainsborough has five landscapes there, of which one especially is worthy of any collection, and of any painter that ever existed. . . . . The exhibition is much inferior to last year's; nobody shines there but Sir Joshua and Gainsborough. The head of the former's Dido is very fine—I do not admire the rest of the piece. His Lord Richard Cavendish is bold and stronger than he ever colored. The picture of my three neices is charming. Gainsborough has two pieces with land and sea, so free and natural, that one steps back for fear of being splashed. The back front of the Academy is handsome, but like the other to the street, the members are so heavy that one cannot stand back enough to see it in any proportion, unless in a barge moored in the middle of the Thames."

AN EXHIBITION AT *DRURY LANE* (1780).

"There has been such an uncommon event that I must give you an account of it, as it relates to the republic of poetry, of which you are President, and to the aristocracy of Noble authors, to whom I am gentleman usher. Lady Craven's comedy called the Minature Picture, which she acted herself with a genteel set at her own house in the country, has been played at Drury Lane. The chief singularity was that she went to it herself the second night, in form; sat in the middle of the front row of the stage box, much dressed with a profusion of white bugles and plumes to receive the public homage due to her sex and loveliness. The Duchess of Richmond, Lady Harcourt, Lady Edgecumbe, Lady Aileshury, Mrs. Damer, Lord Craven, General Conway, Colonel O'Hara, Mr. Lenox, and I were with her. It was amazing to see so young a woman entirely possess herself—but there is such an integrity and frankness in her consciousness of her own beauty and talents, that she speaks of them with a *naïvéte* as if she had no property in them, but only wore them as gifts of the Gods. Lord Craven on the contrary was quite agitated by his fondness for her and with impatience at the bad performance of the actors, which was wretched indeed, yet the address of the plot, which is the chief merit of the piece, and some lively pencilling carried it off very well, though Parsons murdered the Scotch Lord, and Mrs. Robinson (who is supposed to be the favorite of the Prince of Wales) thought on nothing but her own charms, or him. There is a very good though endless Prologue written by Sheridan and spoken in perfection by King, which was encored (an entire novelty) the first night; and an Epilogue that I liked still better and which was full as well delivered by Mrs. Abington, written by Mr. Jekyl, the audience, though very civil, missed a fair opportunity of being gallant, for in one of those —logues, I forget which, the noble authoress was mentioned, and they did not applaud as they ought to have done exceedingly when she condescended to avow her pretty child was there looking so very pretty. I could not help thinking to myself, how many deaths Lady Harcourt would have suffered rather than encounter such an exhibition:—Yet Lady Craven's tranquility had nothing displeasing, it was only the ease that conscious preëminence bestows on Sovereigns whether their Empire consists in power or beauty. It was the ascendant of Millamont and Lady Betty Modish and Indamore; and it was tempered by her infinite good nature, which made her make excuses for the actors instead of being provoked at them."

A HIGHWAY ROBBERY IN 1781.

"Lady Browne and I going to the Duchess of Montrose here at Twickenham Park on Thursday night, as we often do, were robbed by a single horseman, within few yards of the Park-gate. She lost a trifle and I nine guineas; but I had the presence of mind, before I let down the glass, to take out my watch and put it within my waistcoat under my arm. The gentleman, for so I believed he was, declared himself much obliged, pulled off his hat, wished us good night, and I suppose will soon leave us to raise a regiment."

A BON MOT BY FOOTE.

"If you satisfy me, I will tell you the following *bon mot* of Foote, but be sure you don't read what follows till you have obeyed my commands. Foote was at Paris in October, when *Dr. Murray* was, who *admiring* or *dreading* his wit (for commentors dispute on the true reading) often invited him to dinner with his nephew. The ambassador produced a very small bottle of Tokay, and dispensed it in very small glasses. The uncle to prove how precious every drop, said it was of the most exquisite growth, and very old. Foote taking up the diminutive glass, and examining it, replied, "It is very little of its age." Return me my story if you dont perform the conditions."

A BON MOT BY WAFPOLE.

"Last week at Princess Amelie's (another of my courts in minature) Lady Margaret Compton said she was as poor as Job. "I wonder," said Lady Barrymore, "why people only say *as poor as Job*, and never as rich, for in one part of his life he had great riches." "Yes," said I, "Madam, but then they pronounce his name differently, and call him *Jobb*."

CHARLES FOX ANE HIS FRIENDS (1782).

T'other night at Brook's the conversation turned on Lord Falkland: Fitzpatrick said he was a very weak man and owed his fame to Lord Clarendon's partiality. Charles Fox was sitting in deep reverie, with his knife in his hand. "There," continued Fitzpatrick, "I might describe Charles meditating on the ruin of his country, ingeminating the words, peace! peace! and ready to plunge the knife in his own bosom."—"Yes," rejoined Hare in the same ironic dolorous tone, "and he would have done so, but happening to look on the handle of the knife, he saw is was silver and put it in his pocket."

SELWYN'S JOKE ON THE FALL OF LORD NORTH.

"George Selwyn said an excellent thing t'other night. Somebody at White's missing Keene and Williams, Lord North's confidants, asked where they were! "Setting up with the corpse I suppose," said Selwyn. This was quite in character for him, who has been joked with for loving to see executions and dead bodies.

A MYSTERIOUS CITY.

In a Dominican convent near the city of Santa Cruz del Quiché, happened one of the "Incidents of Travel in Central America," which Stephens has so pleasantly recorded. He there met with an eccentric friar, from whom he obtained some curious information respecting the surrounding country. Nothing roused his curiosity so keenly as the Padre's assertion, that, four days' journey on the road to Mexico, on the other side of the great sierra (chain of mountains), was a large and populous city, occupied by Indians, existing precisely in the same state as before the discovery of America. The Padre had heard of it many years before, at the village of Chajul, and was told by the villagers that from the topmost ridge of the sierra this city was distinctly visible. He was then young, and with much labor climbed to the naked summit of the sierra, from which, at a height of ten or twelve thousand feet, he looked over an immense plain, extending to Yucatan and the Gulf of Mexico, and saw at a great distance a large city spread over a great space, and with turrets white and glittering in the sun. The traditionary account of the Indians of Chajul is, that no white man has ever reached this city; that the inhabitants speak the Maya language, are aware that a race of strangers has conquered the whole country around; and, with that fact ever present in their minds, murder any white man who attempts to enter their territory. They have no coin or other circulating medium; no horses, cattle, mules, or other domestic animals, except fowls; and the cocks they keep under ground to prevent their crowing being heard by white travellers.

"There was in all this," says Stephens, "a wild novelty—something that touched the imagination; the old Padre, in the deep stillness of the dimly-lighted convent, with his long black coat like a robe, and his flashing eye, called up an image of the bold and resolute priests who accompanied the armies of the conquerors; and, as he drew a map on the table and pointed out the sierra to the top of which he had climbed, and the position of the mysterious city, the interest awakened in us was the most thrilling I ever experienced. One look at that city was worth ten years of an every-day life. If he is right, a place is left where Indians and an Indian city exists, as Cortez and Alvarado found them; there are living men who can solve the mystery that hangs over the ruined cities of America; perhaps who can go to Copan, and read the inscriptions on its monuments. No subject more exciting and attractive presents itself to my mind, and the deep impression of that night will never be effaced.

"Can it be true? Being now in my sober senses, I do verily believe there is much ground to suppose that what the Padre told us is authentic. That the region referred to does not acknowledge the authority of Guatemala, has never been explored, and that no white man ever pretends to have entered it, I am satisfied. From other sources, we heard that from that sierra a large *ruined* city was visible; and we were told of another person who had climbed to the top of the sierra, but, on account of the dense cloud resting upon it, had been unable to see anything. At all events, the belief at the village of Chajul is general, and a curiosity is roused that burns to be satisfied. We had a craving desire to reach the mysterious city. No man, even if willing to peril his life, could undertake the enterprise, with any hope of success, without hovering for one or two years on the borders of the country, studying the language and character of the adjoining Indians, and making acquaintance with some of the natives. Five hundred men could probably march directly to the city, and the invasion would be more justifiable than any ever made by the Spaniards; but the government is too much occupied with its own wars, and the knowledge could not be procured except at the price of blood. Two young men of good constitution, and who could afford to spare five years, might succeed."

Upon this hint (as we learn from an advertisement in the Boston newspapers) two young men—one a Mr. Huertis, of Baltimore, in the United States, a man of fortune, who had travelled in Egypt, Persia, and Syria, for the inspection of ancient monuments; the other a civil engineer, from Canada, named Hammond—sailed from New Orleans, in 1848, on this perilous and romantic enterprize. They reached Copan on Christmas day, where they met a Spanish merchant, Pedro Velasquez, of San Salvador. He was well acquainted with the country, and knew several of the dialects of the Indians through whose territories they had to pass. He agreed to accompany them. Providing themselves with mules, provender, and an escort of Indians, they commenced their journey to the unknown city. After many perils, they arrived at the top of the high mountain, from which Stephens' priest saw this City of the Sun. They also beheld its domes, turrets, and walls. They descended, and travelled on till they came near the amphitheatre of hills which they thought enclosed the object of their search. They met small groups of Indians, whose dialect they could not understand, and who seemed amazed at seeing them. One of these, however, made them understand that, "about thirty moons ago," a man of the same race as Hammond (who had a florid complexion and red whiskers) had been sacrificed and eaten by the Maehenachs, or Priests of Iximaya, the great city among the hills.

Presently a troop of horsemen passed them, in red and yellow tunics, armed with spears, and each holding in a leash a brace of Spanish bloodhounds, of the purest breed. Their informer told them this was a detachment of rural guards which had been appointed since the Spanish invasion to hunt down and capture all strangers that should be found within a circle of twelve leagues of the city. An engagement ensued, in which the travellers were victors, thanks to their rifles, which created as great a panic as the fire-arms of Cortez. Huertis explained to their chief that they were friendly strangers who desired their hospitality, and to see their magnificent city. The chief said his countrymen showed no hospitality to strangers—it was punishable with death by their laws. The peace and independence of his nation depended on these restrictions; but if they would enter it with the intention of never leaving, he would promise them dwellings, wives, and honors. Huertis informed him, by signs and other expedients, that he would enter the city on his own terms.

Accordingly they all marched towards it, carrying Hammond, who had been desperately wounded. They found that it was surrounded by a wall sixty feet high, enclosing an area of twelve miles; a moat one hundred feet wide encompassed the wall, which was crossed by a drawbridge, raised over the gate. At a signal from the chief, the bridge descended, and the cavalcade passed over. At another signal the ponderous gates unfolded, and a vista of solemn magnificence unfolded itself—an avenue of colossal statues and trees, extending to the opposite side, or western gate; a similar avenue crossed the city from north to south. Arrived at the point where the avenues intersect each other, they were led into a large and lofty hall, surrounded by columns, and displaying three raised seats. These were covered with canopies of rich drapery, on one of which sat the monarch, a person of grave and benignant aspect, of about sixty years old, who was arrayed in scarlet and gold, having a golden image of the rising sun on the back of his throne.

The interview resulted in giving the strangers their freedom within the limits of the city; and permission for them, under indispensable obligations, to become citizens. In the meantime, they were to be maintained as prisoners of state. With this they were satisfied. The residence assigned them was the wing of a spacious structure, which had been appropriated to the surviving remnant of an ancient order of priesthood called Kaanas. Forbidden by involuntary sacred laws from intermarrying with any persons but those of their own caste, these Kaanas had dwindled down to a few individuals, diminutive in stature, and imbecile in intellect. They were nevertheless held in high veneration and affection by the Iximaya community—perhaps as specimens of an antique race nearly extinct. Their ancient residence was chiefly occupied by a higher order of priests, called Wahaqoons, who were their legal and sacerdotal guardians. With one of these, Vaalpeor, Velasquez became very intimate, and while Huertis was devoting himself to the antiquities, hieroglyphics, and pantheism of this unknown city, the young pagan was eagerly imbibing a knowledge of the world at large from Velasquez, which proved to him equally enchanting; so that when the Spaniard proposed the escape of the expedition, with Vaalpeor as their companion he agreed to it. At this time Hammond died of his wounds, and after the funeral they prepared for escape.

When they were ready, Huertis could not be found; two days and nights elapsed; still he did not appear. On searching his rooms, neither his papers nor drawing instruments were to be seen. It was afterwards discovered that Huertis had taken into his confidence one whom he hoped would accompany him, and she had betrayed him. His offence, after his voluntary vows, and his initiation into the sacred mysteries, was unpardonable; his fate could not be doubted. Vaalpeor afterwards admitted that Huertis had been sacrificed in due form on the high altar of the Sun, and that he (Vaalpeor) had beheld the fatal ceremony. As Huertis had not implicated his associates, there was yet a chance for them. After some difficulties, they contrived to escape with Vaalpeor, and the two Aztec or Kaana children of which he was the guardian. In fourteen days, after much suffering, they reached Ocosingo, where Vaalpeor died from the unaccustomed toils and deprivations of the journey. Valasquez, with the two children, reached San Salvador in February. He was advised to send them to the United States, and thence to Europe.

Thus far the story reads more or less glibly; although here and there a suspicion obtrudes itself to cast a hazy shadow of doubt across its authenticity. Against unqualified credence, comes the fact that the two children of the mysterious city have been made a show; and that the account of their origin is derived from their present keeper, who has translated enough of the narrative to explain the children's appearance at Boston; he says the remainder will be published as soon as Velasquez can place the manuscript in proper hands, and inquiries have been made among those who accompanied him.

In a country which boasts of a Barnum, we may be forgiven, therefore, for accompanying the above account of the mysterious city, and the equally mysterious children, with a caution The friends of Mr. Huertis of Baltimore, and those of Mr. Hammond "of Canada," will, doubtless, be applied to by the curious in the States; and from them could at least be gleaned some materials for authenticating the exhibitor's statements. The existence of such a city is too curious and important to be allowed to remain long in doubt.

The children are described as having a tottering and feeble gate, and idiotic look. Their ages are respectively eight and ten.

It is said that the "Exhibition" is on its way from the United States to rival Madame Tussaud's, and the thousand wonders preparing for the coming Fair of the World. Let us hope that among the first visitors will be a categorical Committee from the Ethnographical Society; and that a deputation from the Royal Geograpical Society will exact from the showman a strict account of Don Pedro Velasquez's latitudes and longitudes.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

THE HANGMAN AND THE SCHOOL-MASTER.

Our entertaining little favorite, (says the *London Inquirer*) Mr. Dickens's *Household Words*, prints a number of letters addressed to the High Sheriff of Suffolk, by persons who were desirous to perform Calcraft's work, on the occasion of the hanging of Maria Clarke, at Ipswich. The accompanying comments of our contemporary are not distinguished by the good taste that usually pervades its columns; to many of the opponents of capital punishment the jesting tone has a strange fascination, but perhaps for no other subject is such a vein less fitted. In this instance, the article is headed, "The Finishing School-master," by which is meant, the Hangman; and when Calcraft's expected inability to be present at the execution is recorded, it is said that "the great finishing School-master was pre-engaged to lecture that morning to other pupils in another part of the country." The letters, however, are certified to be exact copies from the originals, and they will give the reader abundance of material for reflection. The first is in the form of a polite note, and has an air of genteel commonplace—like an invitation, or an answer to one:

"Mr.   residing at   Southwark will accept the office unavoidably declined by Calcraft on Wednesday next viz to executs Maria Clarke a speedy answer will oblige stating terms say not less than £20."

"To the High Sheriff of Suffolk."

The second has a Pecksniffian morality in it:

"20 April.

"Sir—This day i Was Reading the newspaper when I saw the advertise for A hangman for that unfortunate Woman if there is not A person coms fored and and that you cannot Get no one by the time i Will come as A suBstitute to finish that which the law require
Yours respect
prepaid   fully
for the Governor of the ipsWich Goal Suffolk."

The third speaks of "Mr. Calcraft," craves secrecy, and states that the writer is in "desperate circumstances."

In the fourth, the writer modestly recommends himself as a self-reliant, trustworthy person:

"April th21/51

"Sir—having understood you Want s Man on Wednesday Morning to Perform the Office Of hangman i beg most respectfully To Offer Myself to your Notice feeling Confident i Am Abel to undertake it. From your obedient Servant,
No   Street   Square   White Chapel."

The fifth is written in a business-like manner, and names sixty pounds as a fair remuneration.

The sixth also is workmanlike:

"Deal. April 21/51

"Honored Sir—Understanding that you cannot get a man to take the job of hanging the Woman on Wednesday next I will volunteer to do the business if the terms are liberal and suit me I remain your respected servant."

In the seventh, the writer says he is a married man, and that his height is 5 feet 5, and his age 32 years.

The writer of the eighth offers himself as a substitute, "being able and competent to fulfil his place on this occasion upon the same terms as Calcraft if you think proper to engage me."

The ninth expects the name to be kept a secret, and if the offer be accepted, "I shall assume the name of Patrick Kelley of Kildare Ireland."

The tenth is honored with the acquaintance of Calcraft, and even aspires to succeed him:

"April 19th 1851

"Gentlemen—Seeing a paragraph in the paper of this day that you are in want of an executioner in the place of Calcraft I have taken the liberty to inform you that you can have me the writer of this note I have been for some time after the birth and am well acquainted with calcraft and I wonder he did not mention my name when you dispatched a messeager to him I made application at horse-monger-lane for the last job there but Calcraft attended himself Gentlemen if you should think fit to nominate me for the job, you will find me a fitt and proper person to fulfil it An answer to the application will oblige me Your most Humble Servant

"And will meet with immediate attention

"Genten—Snould this meet your approbation you will oblige by sending me instructions when and how to come down You will be kind enough to communicate this to the High Sheriff as soon as convenient.

"To the Governor of Ipswich Gaol"

The connection of "the sad office," in the eleventh, with "the amount," almost makes us suspect that the writer is a "mute":

"Cockermouth Apl 21 1851

"Sir—having seen in the paper that Calcraft cannot come up. I will undertake the sad Office if well remunerated and as time is short plesse to say the amount and I will come by return of Post you may depend on me Yours."

This is the twelfth and the last:

"Wigan April 20 1851.

"Sir—Having seen in the Newspaper that you was in want of a man to ociate in the place of Calcraft at the execution of Maria Clarke if you will pay my expenses from Wigan & Back and 5 pounds for the Job. Please to send my expenses from Wigan to Ipswich & direct to the   & he will let me Know

"Your obedient servant."

THE WIT OF CHARLES II.

[From the "Story of Nell Gwyn," by Petter Cunningham in the Gentlemen's Magazine for May.]

"The satirical epitaph written upon King Charles II. at his own request, by his witty favorite the Earl of Rochester, is said to be not more severe than it is just.

'Here lies our sovereign lord, the King,
Whose word no man relies on;
Who never said a foolish thing,
And never did a wise one.'

How witty was the reply: "The matter," he observed, "was easily accounted for—his discourse was his own, his actions were his ministry's."

"His politeness was remarkable, and he could convey a rebuke in the style of a wit and a gentleman. When Penn stood before him with his hat on, the King put off his. 'Friend Charles,' said Penn, 'why dost thou not keep on thy hat?' 'Tis the custom of this place,' replied the monarch in his usual strain of pleasantry, 'that never above one person should be covered at a time.'

"He was altogether in favor of extempore preaching, and was unwilling to listen to the delivery of a written sermon. Patrick excused himself from a chaplaincy, 'finding it very difficult to get sermon without book.' On one occasion the King asked the famous Stillingfleet 'How it was that he always read his sermons before him, when he was informed that he always preached without book elsewhere?' Stillingfleet answered something about the awe of so noble a congregation, the presence of so great and wise a prince, with which the King himself was very well contented. 'But pray,' continued Stillingfleet, 'will your Majesty give me leave to ask you a question? Why do you read your speeches, when you can have none of the same reasons?' 'Why truly, doctor,' replied the King, 'your question is a very pertinent one, and so will be my answer. I have asked the two houses so often, and for so much money, that I am ashamed to look them in the face.' This 'slothful way of preaching,' for so the King called it, had arisen during the civil wars; and Monmouth, when Chancellor of the Universitity of Cambridge, in compliance with the order of the King, directed a letter to the University that the practice of reading sermons should be wholly laid aside.

"Of Barrow he said that 'he was an unfair preacher,' because, as it had been explained, he exhausted every subject, and left no room for others to come after him; but the King's allusion was made somewhat slyly to the extraordinary length as well as to the usual excellence of Barrow's sermons.

"It is better to be envied than pitied," was his observation to Lord Chancellor Clarendon.

"He that takes one stone from the Church takes two from the crown," was another of his sayings preserved by Pepys.

"He said to Lauderdale 'To let Presbytery go, for it was not a religion for gentlemen."